

May 2014

"Your Ticket to Dreamsville": The Functions of 16 Magazine in American Girl Culture of the 1960s

Diana L. Belscamper
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/etd>

 Part of the [United States History Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Belscamper, Diana L., "'Your Ticket to Dreamsville': The Functions of 16 Magazine in American Girl Culture of the 1960s" (2014).
Theses and Dissertations. 663.
<https://dc.uwm.edu/etd/663>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by UWM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UWM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact open-access@uwm.edu.

“YOUR TICKET TO DREAMSVILLE”
THE FUNCTIONS OF 16 MAGAZINE
IN AMERICAN GIRL CULTURE OF THE 1960S

by

Diana L. Belscamper

A Dissertation Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in History

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

May 2014

ABSTRACT
“YOUR TICKET TO DREAMSVILLE”
THE FUNCTIONS OF 16 MAGAZINE
IN AMERICAN GIRL CULTURE OF THE 1960S

by

Diana L. Belscamper

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2014
Under the Supervision of Professor Joe Austin

This analysis reveals the ways in which *16 Magazine* functioned in 1960s American girl culture, largely due to the influence of Gloria Stavers, the magazine’s editor. Stavers used the features in *16 Magazine* to become an emulous mother who guided her readers through their private fantasy space, or “Dreamsville,” as well as the Cold War culture of the 1960s. *16 Magazine*, the most popular youth culture magazine of the 1960s, incorporated dominant ideologies of Cold War anxieties and presented them in subtle, yet effective ways. Profiles of pop music and television stars, advice columns, beauty features, gossip columns, and “Your Ticket to Dreamsville” contests encouraged normative gender and consumer behavior for girls, yet broadened the definitions of “appropriate” behavior and style by incorporating countercultural signifiers, while the language throughout the magazine merged youth lingo with discourses of American patriotism. This project also reveals how the relationships between *16 Magazine* and youth-oriented television programs functioned as entertainment

narratives and models for the negotiations between the public and private spheres during the Cold War era and served as predecessors to contemporary cross-media texts, yet indicate their unique nature as non-corporate transmedia narratives, dependent upon fan participation and interaction while predating new media options for interactivity. This dissertation draws upon historical, cultural, and media theories, including those of Cold War domesticity, youth and girl culture, and transmedia convergence. The interdisciplinary analysis included herein is the first scholarly research that utilizes *16 Magazine* as its primary source material.

© Copyright by Diana L. Belcamper, 2014
All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Preliminary Pages	ii-xii
II. Introduction and Literature Review	1-32
III. Democracy, Duty, and Dreams: The Cultural Climate at <i>16 Magazine's</i> Inception	33-74
IV. Gloria Stavers and "The Magazine for Smart Girls": The Distinctions of <i>16 Magazine</i> , 1960-1963	75-113
V. Buying Into the British invasion: Using Pop Stars to Cultivate Femininity and Consumer Behavior, 1964-1966	114-162
VI. "We're the Young Generation and We've Got Something to Say": Emphasizing the <i>Establishment</i> in "Anti-Establishment," 1967-1969	163-210
VII. Conclusion	211-224
VIII. Curriculum Vitae	225-228

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A project of this magnitude is not the result of one person's efforts; to the contrary, countless individuals advanced its progress and completion. So many contributors, some of whom I never met in person, provided endless enthusiasm, motivation, and determination when my own wavered. And to those whose confidence in my completion of this project never abated, I owe my greatest gratitude.

The spark for this project was fired nearly ten years ago in my first course with Joe Austin. Joe has been a tireless advisor, advocate, mentor, educator, and confidant. Always with a brilliant word of advice, patience beyond expectations, and a fabulous sense of humor, Joe let me work at my pace, knowing the end results would justify the erratic means. I truly cannot imagine a more complementary advisor and director for my work.

Rachel Buff provided great insight and recommendations for areas of my general history edification that needed boosting. She targeted areas that needed explanation and allowed me to find my own way through them. Her suggestions and framing of the Cold War revitalized my enthusiasm for American history and its foibles. Tasha Oren provided me with an interdisciplinary scope that was essential to the foundation of this project, and without which my own expertise would be diminished greatly. Her advice and advocacy of my work, though not always in her scholarly niche, was essential to the multi-faceted analysis included herein. Carol Stabile encouraged my ventures into media theory and the

application of media studies methodologies, specifically regarding mass-market magazines, to my research in girl culture and *16 Magazine* in particular. Her enthusiasm and guidance helped me see the viability of my research across disciplines. Merry Wiesner-Hanks has been a bolstering source of support and enthusiasm for my work, both in the discipline and in the classroom. Her recommendations and advice never fail me, and her gracious consideration of my work is always deeply appreciated. Special thanks go to David Hoeveler and Aims McGuinness, for their encouragement, advice, humor, and wisdom along the way, as well as Phillip Naylor, Steven Avella, and Athan Theoharis for encouraging me to pursue my Ph.D. in history after years away from the discipline.

The Department of History at UW-Milwaukee generously awarded me funding through the David S. Buck Honorary Dissertation Research Grant, Lucetta Bissell Memorial Fellowship, Department of History Graduate Research Grant, and Chancellor's Graduate Student Award, which allowed me to amass an archive of teen magazines rivaling that of any academic institution. My heartfelt gratitude is extended to Professor David Buck and the Awards Committee for their generosity and enthusiasm for my research. The Graduate School at UW-Milwaukee graciously awarded me the Graduate School Fellowship and the Graduate School Dissertation Fellowship, which gave me the freedom to work as a part-time instructor and project assistant while completing this project. In addition, I thank the editors of the *Encyclopedia of Milwaukee*, especially Amanda Seligman and Jim Marten, who provided me with an assistantship that

allowed me to continue working on my dissertation at full speed while working as a local cultural historian as well. My year of alternating research on Milwaukee sports with *16 Magazine's* "fave raves" was immensely enjoyable.

My research could not have been completed without the generosity of the UCLA Film and Television Archive's Research and Study Center. Being awarded their Visiting Scholar Research Grant allowed me access to their astonishing collection of youth-oriented television shows I could not access anywhere else. My viewing of episodes of *Shindig*, *Hullabaloo*, *Malibu U*, *American Bandstand*, and *Where the Action Is!* restructured how I conceived of this project, and made my interpretations and arguments immeasurably stronger. Mark Quigley and Silvia Chilin's enthusiasm and assistance during my weeklong visit to their archive receive my unqualified appreciation.

My collection of primary source material for this project began as a hobby more than 20 years ago. However, as I realized what exactly I had in my collection and the need to acquire a much broader sample, I turned to the Internet, eBay.com in particular. I offer my gratitude and appreciation to the countless vendors and collectors who provided the vast majority of my collection. In addition, appreciation goes to Musical Memories in Milwaukee, whose variety of vintage music magazines is always eclectic, but never lacking for something I need.

On the personal side, my debts are great to so very many people – for knowledge, camaraderie, inspiration, and strength when I needed it most.

My earliest and most integral attraction to this time period and its music was fostered by the joy and knowledge shared every morning by John Gardner on WEMP-AM 1250 in Milwaukee. His voice still permeates my thoughts and recollections of eras past. Gregory Jon ably followed in John's footsteps during the resurgence of the Mighty 92, and continues to provide me with humor and valued contacts.

To Bob Newhart and Dennis Miller, I owe perhaps my most eccentric, yet necessary, thanks. Their comedic work led me to discover Vance Packard and Betty Betz, the writings of whom provided valuable content and essential context for my analysis.

To the multitudes of Gloria Stavers "ravers" I've met online, I extend my appreciation and gratitude. Their personal stories, insights, and memories reinforced my confidence in the validity of my research, as well as the endless influence Miss Stavers continues to have on American women. Karen Steele's devotion to Miss Stavers's life and legacy on her website, gloriastavers.com, gave me essential connections to both content and contacts. Special mention must be given to Mimi Gitterman Menendez and Nola Leone, whose own careers were enhanced by their relationships with Miss Stavers and who both assured me my reading of Miss Stavers's agenda with *16 Magazine* was right on point.

The wit, whimsy, and sheer devotion to their crafts exhibited by many of the pop stars discussed herein continue to entertain and inspire multitudes of fans. To Mark and Deb Lindsay, Phil Volk and Tina Mason, Peter Noone, Jim Valley, Paul Petersen, Billy Hinsche, and Don Grady, I owe my thanks for their

online commentaries and interviews, photos, and accounts of their experiences as idols, then and now. In addition, my conversations with Michael Johns and David Cook guided me to the connections between the magazine-based fan culture of the past and the online fan culture of today. The comments and perspectives of Micky Dolenz and Michael Nesmith, regarding both Gloria Stavers and my work on this project, were immensely helpful, motivating, and enlightening.

To Alex, Amy, Carla, Colin, Dave, Ed, Julie, Karen, Kathy, Laura, Patricia, and Raul – your support, feedback, and friendship were so essential to completing this project. For providing me with camaraderie, comfort, humor, food, and cocktails whenever I needed them most, I thank you.

To Dr. John Betz, Dr. Mark Hodgson, Dr. James Lincer, Dr. Mark Zylstra, Janelle Clark, Dorothy Harris, David Faust, Kawana Momon, and Jodi Katzung – I owe you my greatest gratitude for physically bringing me back to a point where this project was no longer a dream, but could be a reality.

To Paul and Henry - you are my soul brothers, never lacking in support, advice, humor, sympathy, and love. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

To my sister - I cannot thank you enough for listening to a million more ideas that never made it into print; for being a tireless supporter of all of my ventures; for accompanying me on all my crazy journeys; for encouraging me every step of the way; and for constantly supporting me, in every possible way, even in the bleakest times. I truly could not have done this without you.

This work is dedicated to my dear Henry Blanco, who wholeheartedly encouraged me to pursue my Ph.D. and believed in this project from its earliest stages. You never once doubted I would complete this undertaking, and consistently supported it when my own confidence faltered. Your strength got me through this - though you aren't here to see it, my success would not be possible without you. My love is with you always.

Diana L. Belscamper
February 2014

“16 had no editorial staff other than Gloria. Which is why most of the artists... talk about her and the magazine as if they were one entity. They were.”

Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields

Introduction and Literature Review

“After all, what these girls are doing is what everybody is doing – they’re searching. There’s something that’s over there. When they get it, it’s just human nature to add to it, to embellish it, to change it, to make it better, or to go on to something else. This spiritual longing keeps us all going – and these children have it too.” – Gloria Stavers¹

In 1958, when the publishers of *16 Magazine* placed their faith in a young clerical assistant, a former model with no journalistic background named Gloria Stavers, the publication became a moderate success. For the next few years, Stavers toyed with the formula of the magazine that would become the cornerstone of the teen music publication market. She realized that, rather than a mere fan magazine, her readers were searching for a “space” in which they could not only read about their favorite stars, but also express their own feelings about these stars and much more. Stavers’ timing was ideal. While she was shaping the format of the magazine, The Beatles triumphed on stage, screen, and vinyl in the United States and around the world, opening the doors for a popular music revolution that would alter youth culture thereafter. As popular music and its stars became the pinnacle of America’s teenage commodity culture, Gloria Stavers and *16 Magazine* were at the forefront of every trend that would follow.

However, more than just a magazine reporting the stars’ hates and loves and displaying their fans’ love and devotion, *16 Magazine* opened up an environment within its pages for girls to develop into culturally aware consumers and practice the emotional behaviors of heterosexual romance and homosocial

camaraderie. *16 Magazine*'s advice columns, feature articles, and interviews informed girls of how they could most effectively become attractive, confident, and popular young women – usually through the auspices of fashion, beauty products, and hip record collections. However, *16 Magazine* went beyond the usual rhetoric of image-consciousness. Within the pages of *16 Magazine*, discourses of becoming part of a community with these “fave raves” were perpetuated. *16 Magazine* encouraged its readers to “imagine” themselves in conversations, on dates, and in the same social circles as their idols – and, in some instances, to “dream” themselves so close to the stars as to kiss their lips (isolated, without the rest of the face, on pin-ups) or to request, through entry forms, clothing and hair from the young men themselves. The monthly feature “A Trip to Dreamsville” revealed which selected readers had earned personalized gifts from their favorite stars, creating imagined bonds between star and fan through the guise of commodity collection. In essence, Stavers used the pages of *16 Magazine* to encourage girls to become consumers as they matured into young women. Obviously, this would not only encourage sales of the magazine, but of the artists' recordings, films, fan club subscriptions, and any other products affiliated with the stars. Stavers' logic was clear – as long as the stars stayed popular, her magazine would sell and the artists, recognizing the influence *16 Magazine* had on their popularity, would continue to offer exclusive interviews, photos, and features to the magazine, perpetuating the consumer cycle.

The main goal for magazine publishers, or any other media outlet, is to increase sales and profits. The advertisers who purchase advertising space in

magazines seek increased profits through product sales, and magazines respect that desire by featuring plugs within editorial content for their prime advertisers. This holds true for nearly every major publication, and especially dictates the content of women's and teen magazines. What is so remarkable about *16 Magazine* is that its editor did not accept outside advertising. The magazine's profits were generated solely from its newsstand sales and subscriptions. As Gloria Stavers cultivated new generations of consumers, she did so without the influence of any outside companies with vested interests in selling their products. Gloria Stavers influenced the consumer citizens in her audience solely through the editorial content of *16 Magazine*. A detailed analysis of the magazine's content reveals the practices girls were encouraged to follow, the appearances and behaviors they were urged to emulate, and the ways in which Stavers facilitated the creation of a space for readers to share their feelings, concerns, and dreams. With Gloria Stavers as their guide, generations of girls in America were able to create and live in their own "Dreamsville," replete with attractive young men, hip pop music, trendy fashions, and "secret sisters" who would assist them during their journey. Given its enormous popularity, *16 Magazine* became an influential site for the intersection of American social and cultural norms, popular music and television, and girl culture of the 1960s.

The interpretations and content analyses that inspired and informed this project are numerous and varied. They span disciplines, eras, and methodologies, and range from cultural theories to personal memoirs. However, they do have several crucial points in common: images of femininity, consumer

behavior, and functions of magazines (or similar media) in communicating messages to women and girls. The primary sources analyzed and discussed herein comprise a significant element of material culture produced for, and utilized by, girls reaching adolescence during the 1960s, highlighting the historical relevance of girlhood during the 20th century. Applying cultural analysis methodologies to these popular culture texts from the 1960s results in the broadened understanding and greater significance of girls and their everyday lives within the larger context of American history of the Cold War era.

Social and cultural historians generally agree that teenagers were identified as a targeted market within American consumer culture in the post-World War II era. In these years of the “baby boom,” youth culture blossomed amidst economic prosperity, which allowed them significant amounts of discretionary spending dollars, and greater high school attendance, which cultivated a peer culture that enhanced teenagers’ separation from their parents’ influence and culture. This adolescent youth culture raised concerns among social critics, who feared that decreased parental authority would lead to generations of delinquents and open the door for subversive ideologies and activities during the Cold War.

Some cultural producers, aware of such concerns, created products that would stave off subversive influences while encouraging consumer practices and defending democratic ideals. The producers of America’s most popular teen magazines at that time supported these practices and their publications fostered the incorporation of responsible consumerism within youth culture during the era.

Advertisers and editorial staffs of popular magazines reflected and cultivated a unique girls' culture within the contexts of consumer culture and perceptions of idealized femininity during the 1950s and 1960s. By doing so, these producers encouraged teenage girls to become not only ideal girls, but ideal consumers as well. The sense of civic duty and the responsibility to uphold American ideals were reflected in the model of the "civic consumer," notably espoused and represented in the pages of *Seventeen*. However, other magazines tailored this model for their own purposes, including *16 Magazine*. Before an analysis of how editor Gloria Stavers perceived the audience of *16 Magazine* and used the language, columns, and features within its pages to foster a "Dreamsville" for the readers is presented, the interpretive frameworks that address how magazine producers attracted their audiences and created content to cultivate consumers will be established. These framing influences fall into two major categories: those that assess consumer culture and media influences on women and girls, and those that evaluate the functions of youth-oriented media within girl culture.

Consumer Culture and Mass Media

In *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century*, Richard Ohmann assessed the roles of magazine publishers, advertisers, and editors in the formation of an American mass culture in the 1890s. Ohmann argued that popular magazines helped the emerging professional middle class negotiate the changing realms of public and private life as they were affected by the new consumer culture. Ohmann presented

numerous examples of how the photographs, advertisements, feature articles, and monthly departments of magazines were designed to reduce the distance between the reader and the subject at hand. In essence, magazine producers “located the reader socially” in the same types of environments and situations in which the subjects lived, creating an imaginary community in which the readers and the “elites” who were profiled had common needs and desires, which could best be addressed through consumer practices - especially through the purchase and use of the products advertised within the magazines’ pages.²

Ellen Gruber Garvey expanded upon Ohmann’s arguments in *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s*. Garvey described more agency among the consumers and specifically revealed how girls used magazines and the advertising within to “articulate and comment on their own fantasies.”³ Garvey also revealed how producers and consumers together constructed languages and practices of consumerism, rather than a passive process of readers absorbing messages, noting “these readers were constructed, and constructed themselves, as consumers.”⁴

Lizabeth Cohen’s interpretation of the “purchaser citizen,” as established in *A Consumer’s Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*, asserted that consumerism served as a way to preserve American ideals and boost civic responsibility amid the rhetoric and ideology of the Cold War. Cohen argued that in the aftermath of a conflict between “citizen consumers” and “purchaser consumers” during World War II, “a new postwar ideal of the purchaser as citizen who simultaneously fulfilled personal desire and

civic obligation by consuming” emerged, setting the stage for a remarkable expansion of consumer culture during the Cold War era.⁵ Cohen’s analysis also highlighted the specific attraction of marketers to teenagers in the postwar era, and the emergence of advertising focused on the teen demographic, spurred by advertising pioneer Eugene Gilbert. The influence of Gilbert will be addressed later in this analysis, especially as his pronouncements regarding the youth market strongly influenced the producers who advertised in *Seventeen* and other media outlets targeting teenagers.

Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media, written by Susan J. Douglas, is an overview of the impact mass media had on generations of girls and women during the twentieth century. Supplemented by her own personal recollections and opinions, Douglas utilized the texts of girls and women’s magazines, advertisements, song lyrics, news broadcasts, television shows, and films from the 1940s through the 1980s to reveal the dichotomy of media messages regarding women amidst the evolving feminist movement in America. Douglas repeatedly questioned the conflicting images of docile, subservient, middle class, “ladylike” femininity and outspoken, commanding, independent feminism that were depicted simultaneously in the mass media. She noted that by the 1980s, advertisers “had figured out how to make feminism – and antifeminism – work for them.”⁶ She credited the feminist movement for encouraging many women to disregard the ridiculous prescribed images of femininity in fashion magazines and other media, yet admitted that she, like many other women, found guilty pleasure in paging through *Vogue* and

Cosmopolitan and wishing she could live the “fantasy” lives of the women pictured on their pages.⁷

Grace Palladino’s *Teenagers* addressed the development of youth consumer culture in the 1940s and how teenagers were instrumental in creating their own youth culture. Palladino examined how advertisers and merchandisers recognized the appeal and profitability of the new youth market, noting, “roots of the teenage market reached back to the 1920’s, when the high school population first began to grow.”⁸ Marketers were essential in the development of the new high school culture, convincing “students to see themselves as a class apart, as ‘teenagers,’ according to popular standards, with their own age-related tastes, styles, and social concerns.”⁹ Family magazines acknowledged this unique culture, and included columns and features that included social and style advice for adolescents. Within a few years, *Seventeen* would begin publication, creating a magazine specifically for the teenage girl market. Palladino described the impact of *Seventeen* on the youth market and in shaping teenage trends, as well as the role Eugene Gilbert played in cultivating a youth consumer culture. According to Palladino, “On one level, the magazine would translate teenage tastes and buying habits for advertisers and manufacturers. On another, it would teach inexperienced consumers the fine points of intelligent buying.”¹⁰ The influences of *Seventeen* and Eugene Gilbert on the identification and promotion of a distinct youth culture clearly is significant. Numerous historians have discussed the cultural precedents that *Seventeen* depicted and encouraged in its portrayal of feminine “norms”; however, others argued that a youth consumer

culture was established decades before the 1940s. Regardless, the impact of *Seventeen* and other teen magazines in constructing cultural norms, especially regarding gender roles and idealized images of female beautification, cannot be disputed.

Kathy Peiss discussed the emphasis placed on cosmetics in twentieth-century American culture in *Hope in a Jar: The Making of America's Beauty Culture*. Peiss stated, "Mass media tied cosmetics ever more closely to notions of feminine identity and self-fulfillment, proliferating images of flawless female beauty – mostly youthful, white, and increasingly sexualized. The made-up face would now be... firmly bound to the internal workings of the female psyche."¹¹ Peiss' analysis warrants discussion because it directly relates to many of the normative concepts of beauty, consumerism, and the white, middle-class image of the "ideal" teenager. During World War II, as women entered the workforce in great numbers, the attention placed on femininity was exemplified by the exemption of cosmetics from rationing, as "beautifying had evolved... into an assertion of American national identity," and the creation of the first cosmetics expressly produced for a teenage market.¹² In the 1950s, adult cosmetics and their advertising changed, focusing on a more sexualized image of femininity and contrasting with the debut of Cover Girl's line of cosmetics featuring a look of "wholesome beauty" for teenage girls. By the 1960s, "makeup fashions identified cliques and cultural groups within the teenage world."¹³ Kathy Peiss's summary of the evolving cosmetics industry, including its acknowledgment of distinct and profitable youth trends and the priority placed on cosmetically enhancing

femininity with consumer goods during the Cold War era, highlighted many themes that are addressed in the next section of this review, those that utilize content analysis of youth-oriented media texts to reveal messages of prescribed gender roles and normalized behavior that were reinforced for American girls.

Youth-Oriented Media and Girl Culture

“When we come to deal with ‘teenage’ entertainments and culture, the distinction between media and audience is difficult to maintain.”¹⁴ Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel clearly could see the convergence of teenagers and media through popular music while rock and roll emerged as a global phenomenon, and their analysis in 1964’s *The Performing Arts* provided an early inspiration for this project. As they noted, “Popular music has an enormous hold on young people at a certain age, involving intense loyalty and identification. Part of its attraction in fact is that it is so much a young person’s province and not part of school or the adult world in general.”¹⁵ They also found that British cultural influences were emerging in American popular culture, yet could not explain exactly why:

Is it significant (encouraging) that [British] talents are now more widely hailed than their American counterparts? What is the meaning of the new emphasis on provincial accents? How can we account for the success of The Beatles? In strictly musical terms? Or has it more to do with their attitudes? How are these attitudes expressed? What is it about them that we admire?¹⁶

Hall and Whannel also explained quite thoroughly the motivations that encouraged producers of teen music magazines, especially Gloria Stavers and

the publishers of *16 Magazine*, without any acknowledgement, nor likely any awareness, of the magazine itself.

... [a] widespread change in attitudes and style reveals itself among the younger generation – a change which reflects partly their enhanced economic status and partly the changing design of social values in the society as a whole... More particularly, the increased spending power of the younger generation, and the development of something approaching a discernable “youth culture,” means that a fairly direct connection can be made between the younger generation and the media. In some fields the media are sustained economically by the adolescent market, and much of the material communicated is intended for that age group. The media provide young people with information and ideas about the society into which they are maturing... At the deeper level, the use of the media to provide imaginative experiences through various forms of art and entertainment has a modifying impact upon young people’s attitudes and values.¹⁷

Hall and Whannel outlined the very formula that Stavers utilized in her direction of *16 Magazine*, and even indicated how a specific space, through “imaginative experiences,” could influence teenagers in their social and consumer development.

Dick Hebdige outlined an influential explanation of the motivations and identifications of subcultures in *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Hebdige’s analysis primarily was concerned with resistant subcultures that emerged in England in the decades following World War II. However, his general criteria for identifying subcultures prove useful for this analysis in that he considered the emergence of youth culture and how it was represented.

However, the challenge to hegemony which subcultures represent is not issued directly by them. Rather it is expressed obliquely, in style. The objections are lodged, the contradictions displayed... at the profoundly superficial level of appearances: that is, at the level of signs... Style in subculture is, then, pregnant with significance...

As such, [transformations in style] are gestures, movements towards a speech which offends the “silent majority,” which challenges the principle of unity and cohesion, which contradicts the myth of consensus.¹⁸

While Hebdige focused on the political ramifications of subcultural activity in England, especially as it involved class differences, his identification of style and visual signifiers as the primary forms of subculture representation, both internal to the subculture and to external observers, applies to any type of subculture which differentiates itself from the parent culture. American girl culture of the 1960s heavily relied on fashion and style to differentiate itself from the parent culture. While teen fashion magazines obviously included indicators of the trends present in the ever-changing teenage girl culture, *16 Magazine* also included suggestions of fashions and styles that would signify its readers as part of “the in crowd.” These signifiers went beyond fashion advice; in fact, aside from general references to clothing styles, fashion layouts were not featured in the pages of *16 Magazine*.¹⁹ However, in its advice columns, readers learned from female fashion icons of the era, such as Connie Francis and Cher, what signifiers would be useful in attracting “the right boys.” Later, after the magazine and youth culture were overwhelmingly influenced by British trends, features on how to look like a Beatle’s girlfriend were interspersed with advice columns from prominent British “birds,” such as Pattie Boyd, Jill Stuart, Twiggy, and Samantha Juste, on how to adapt their own style to an “appropriate” style for girls.

Simon Frith specifically discussed the impact of rock music on girl culture and critiqued teen music magazines in *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock ‘n’ Roll*. He also established a difference between “female music,

teeny bop” and “male music, cock-rock” and how girls “relat[e] to rock through different discourses of sexuality.”²⁰ Frith dismissed the importance of *music* in girls’ fascination with pop stars and highlighted the emphasis on other commodities, especially magazines:

... if the focus on teeny-bop culture is usually a pop star (such teeny stars come and go in three-year cycles), the cultural symbol is less records (though girls are more likely to buy singles than boys) than magazines... the sight of the star [is] more important than his sound. Teenage girls’ magazines... have always shown “a dominant interest in pop stars and the pop scene,” but their interest has been less in music than in chat and clothes and possessions and pictures. The circulation of such magazines is heavily dependent on the potency of the *image* of the latest teenage idol...²¹

Frith discounted the value of teen music magazines as promotional fluff, but his arguments identified a crucial element of *16 Magazine*’s strategy during the 1960s: “Female music, teeny-bop, is by contrast [to cock-rock], a confidential, private discourse.” He continued by asserting that “female consumers are addressed, by contrast [to male fans], as individuals, the potential objects of the performer’s private needs.”²² However, Frith generalized beyond teeny-bopper culture and claimed that girl culture, or “staging the feminine show,” was bolstered by incorporating pop music and its idols as a way to manage “the sexual and emotional tensions implicit in a girl’s role.”²³ Frith criticized and dismissed teen magazines, overlooking the essence of Gloria Stavers’ motivation behind *16 Magazine* and failing to connect the private “space” that the magazine provided its readers and the “emotional tensions” they faced as girls.²⁴ Although he circled around them, Frith clearly missed the signs for “Dreamsville.”

Angela McRobbie provided useful indicators of how teen magazines can be critiqued when analyzing girl culture in “*Jackie Magazine: Romantic Individualism and the Teenage Girl.*” McRobbie critiqued *Jackie*, one of Britain’s best-selling teen magazines, “as a system of messages, a signifying system and a bearer of a certain ideology, an ideology which deals with the construction of teenage femininity.”²⁵ While *Jackie* was predominantly a fashion magazine, many of the characteristics McRobbie addressed pertain to other teen magazines as well. McRobbie’s argument was that “*Jackie* occupies the sphere of the personal or private” and that within it “teenage girls are subjected to an explicit attempt to win consent to the dominant order – in terms of femininity, leisure and consumption, i.e. at the level of culture. The ‘teen’ magazine is a highly privileged ‘site.’ Here the girls’ consent is sought uncoercively and in their leisure time.”²⁶

McRobbie described the magazine’s structure as well:

It is to be glanced through, looked at and only finally read... [The reader] has time to pass it round her friends or swap it for another magazine... *Jackie* deals primarily with the terrain of the personal and it marks a turning inwards to the sphere of the “soul,” the “heart” or the emotions... [Its] visual appearance and style also reflects the spending power of its readers.²⁷

McRobbie also directly addressed how *Jackie* depicted pop stars. She noted that “the musical side of pop is pushed into the background and is replaced instead with the persona of the pop idol.”²⁸ Because of *Jackie*’s significant circulation figures, “it is obviously highly sought-after by record promoters and hence is able to choose from a vast range of stars... [However] it is always much easier to ‘sell’ established acts than to promote newcomers.” Most significantly, “Music itself is

credited with little or no importance in the pages of *Jackie*. This is an important point because it marks the one area in which readers *could* be drawn into a real hobby.”²⁹ While *Jackie* was a British teen magazine, the characteristics that McRobbie outlined bear many similarities to *16 Magazine*. The private sphere that brings together femininity, leisure, and consumption, while focusing on style, fashion, and pop music stars summarizes the basis of both magazines well. In a parallel to Frith’s argument, McRobbie argued that *Jackie*’s primary goal was to cultivate “romantic individualism” in girls, with no acknowledgement of “female solidarity.”³⁰

Ilana Nash used her own experiences as a “teenybopper” in 1970’s Los Angeles as the basis for her conclusions in “Hysterical Scream or Rebel Yell? The Politics of Teen-Idol Fandom.” Nash discussed the differences between teenyboppers and rocker girls in the midst of the feminist movement, and the messages that the media provided as entertainment for both groups. She stated that “girls defined their identities through one of two musical styles: ‘hard rock’ or teen-idol pop, sometimes called ‘bubblegum’... The general consensus was that these styles formed the opposite ends of the teen-girl spectrum.”³¹ She used the editorial content from *16 Magazine* and *Tiger Beat*, music magazines designed for teenage girls, to highlight differences in sexual ideology and depictions of femininity for girls growing up in the shadow of feminism. Nash ultimately argued that the teen music magazines of the 1970s depicted a different image of teenage girls than the “Teena” of fashion magazines.

Nash described the differences between teenyboppers and rocker girls in terms of their lifestyles and the music that they liked. “Hard rock was the only style granted cultural legitimacy. It represented a more ‘authentic’ youth culture built around a philosophy of rebellion and its code phrase was ‘sex, drugs, and rock ‘n’ roll.” Rocker girls listened to artists such as Ted Nugent, Lynyrd Skynyrd, and Led Zeppelin, and had a “bad girl” image as girls who were familiar with drugs and were sexually active. Teenyboppers listened to Top 40 artists, such as Shaun Cassidy, Leif Garrett, and the Bay City Rollers, “were well socialized and relatively wholesome; whether [they] actually had sex or not... [they] were assumed not to.”³² Nash’s description of the teenybopper parallels the depictions in cosmetic advertisements aimed at teenage girls, such as Cover Girl’s “wholesome, nice girls.”

Nash also outlined the images of “new freedom” femininity depicted in the media, including the rocker girl, feminist, and superheroine, but disputed that any of them were truly feminist. Instead, Nash argued that the teenybopper actually espoused more of the ideals of feminism; within the teenybopper culture was “a realm of experience that treated [girls] more seriously and respectfully... Fandom felt exhilaratingly progressive.”³³ The respect that Nash described was exemplified in *16 Magazine*, as it was written and edited by Gloria Stavers. “*16 Magazine* maintained a consistent editorial tone that reflected editor Gloria Stavers’ respect for, and commitment to, the emotional concerns of her readership.”³⁴ *16 Magazine* did not accept advertising, which eliminated the external influence of advertisers attempting to cultivate an insecure teenage

population who would feel the need to consume their products. Nash cited *16 Magazine*'s editors to emphasize her argument that teen music magazines cultivated a different type of teenage girl: "16's editors, whether it was Gloria or any of her successors, tried mightily to infuse whatever self-esteem we could into those readers."³⁵ Nash also drew contrasts between *16 Magazine* and *Tiger Beat*, noting that *Tiger Beat* distinguished itself by featuring more female stars and less emphasis on female subjectivity to male stars as the feminism of the 1970s became more pervasive. Nash claimed that the messages communicated by these girls' music magazines were very valuable in comparison to the girls' fashion magazines because "only in those magazines could we find our tastes and our feelings treated as 'just so,' as facts that required no examination, criticism or apology. These magazines gave us a room of our own into which we could retreat from the chorus of contempt we received from other teens and adults alike."³⁶ In essence, teen music magazines helped create and nurture a girls' culture based on music fandom, but also helped girls deal with the negative images that were presented in the popular fashion magazines.

Teenage girls were identified as a market force in the post-World War II era, as the rapid expansion of American consumer culture occurred. Popular magazine editorial staffs and advertisers continued to reflect and cultivate a unique girls' culture within the contexts of this consumer culture and the conformist images of the "ideal woman" during the 1950s. As the women's liberation movement gained momentum during the 1960s and 1970s, magazines and advertisers responded to pressures to change their outdated messages, yet

continued to reinforce traditional gender roles for girls while using feminist language to disguise their motives. Studies of magazines and advertising directed at teenage girls in the 1980s and 1990s reveal that the same normative messages and expectations that have existed since the early twentieth century are still in use. Recent literature on the construction and emergence of an American teenage girls' culture, as reflected in the popular magazines and advertising designed for this demographic group during the twentieth century, reveals that magazines and advertisers portray a fairly consistent image of the "ideal teenage girl" and unanimously agreed upon who "Teena," to use the phrasing of *Seventeen* magazine, is.³⁷ "Teena," the prototypical teenage girl that magazines and advertisers perpetuate, is a white, middle-class girl who is feminine and "ladylike," dwells on romance, and is supportive of boys and/or men in a variety of ways. Appearance is the most important consideration for "Teena," with knowledge and skills much less important for success in life, regardless if she is seeking success in the private or public sphere. Throughout the twentieth century, the meanings of some of these criteria have changed (especially how femininity and romance are defined) and these criteria have had varying levels of influence.

Laura M. Carpenter, in "From Girls into Women: Scripts for Sexuality and Romance in *Seventeen* Magazine" evaluated articles on sexuality and romance from the 1970s to the 1990s in *Seventeen* to determine the changes and continuities in the magazine's depiction of sexuality.³⁸ Carpenter argued that the scripting approach in *Seventeen*'s articles perpetuated gender inequality that is

learned during adolescence and the effects of which may last through a woman's lifetime, and that the editors of *Seventeen* continued to encourage traditional normative sexual practices in "a maneuver to protect society from women's sexuality and power" and to continue perpetuating the "overwhelmingly white, heterosexual, and middle class" image of their idealized teenager.³⁹ In "Narrative Analysis of Sexual Etiquette in Teenage Magazines," Ana Garner, Helen M. Sterk, and Shawn Adams analyzed the content of advice columns published in teen and women's magazines in 1974, 1984, and 1994. They concluded that the advice and messages in these magazines changed very little over the decades and contained very specific normative messages regarding gender roles and behavior. In their words, "Teen magazines limit women's sociality and sexuality within narrowly defined heterosexual norms and practices."⁴⁰ Garner, et al., argued that teen magazines encouraged girls to be sexually active and that once girls have "adapt[ed] themselves to male-defined sexual expression, they must also teach men their own needs and how to satisfy them."⁴¹ This argument supported Carpenter's interpretation that teen magazines depicted sexual behavior in traditional, normative terms and that magazines perpetuated these norms to reduce girls' power and influence in male-female relationships.

Sharon R. Mazzarella surveyed special prom issues of popular girls' magazines in "The 'Superbowl of All Dates': Teenage Girl Magazines and the Commodification of the Perfect Prom." She evaluated the editorial content and advertisements in these special issues of *Seventeen*, *Teen*, *YM*, and *Your Prom* from 1994 and 1995, and found that all of these issues depicted the power and

control that were accessible from choosing the right commodities and practicing physical beautification. The advice given in these magazines, in columns and advertisements, promoted beautification as a leisure activity and a group activity to be shared with other girls.⁴² Mazzarella concluded that the fear tactics utilized in the magazines, stressing the importance of the right dress, the right beauty products, and the right date, cultivated insecurity and the need for personal improvement. Mazzarella also cited Angela McRobbie and Naomi Wolf's observations that magazines for girls and women "typically include step-by-step guides to... physical beautification," which were designed to promote insecurity in girls, as well as encourage the need for the advertisers' commodities. Wolf's "Beauty Myth," the phenomenon of the excessive emphasis teen magazines place on physical appearance which is directly related to the advertisers' need to sell products to women, is used by Mazzarella to support her findings.⁴³

In "Producing Girls: Rethinking the Study of Female Youth Culture," Mary Celeste Kearney included texts produced by girls in her analysis of the formation of girls' culture. In this study, Kearney used the content of popular teen magazines produced for girls and "zines" produced by girls to evaluate the depictions of teenage girls in the media and how these texts contributed to the development of girls' youth culture. Kearney referred to Angela McRobbie's argument that "consumption is often 'inflated' to the point that 'each and every transaction or acquisition becomes a grand gesture of will, an act of opposition or an expression of identity,'" and that girls' culture, exemplified by teenyboppers, "is connected more to family, domesticity, and romance and, therefore, offers girls

different possibilities for resisting social expectations.”⁴⁴ Kearney also noted earlier interpretations that suggested girls are only capable of consumption and feminist analyses that focused on girls’ interactions with mass-produced commodities.⁴⁵ Kearney’s dissatisfaction with the “girls only as consumers” interpretations is evident in her discussion of the roles that girls themselves play in the development of their own culture, most recently exemplified by the zines produced by and for girls. Taking her inspiration from McRobbie’s critique of teen magazines, Kearney proposed that girls are not only capable of producing their own culture, they actively do so. While popular teen magazines such as *Seventeen* rarely, if ever, represented girls as cultural producers, many zines were created and distributed by girls for their peers. Kearney championed these texts which “explode the myth of a single form of female adolescent subjectivity (as well as a homogenous girls’ culture).”⁴⁶ However, she acknowledged that “many girls’ opportunities for self-authorization... are limited not just by their gender and generational position, but also by their class, race, ethnicity, and sexuality.”⁴⁷ In other words, the most frequent contributors to the girls’ self-produced culture were the white, middle-class girls so often depicted in the mainstream teen magazines.

Sherrie Inness discussed the images of “tough women” in women’s magazines in “Pretty Tough: The Cult of Femininity in Women’s Magazines.” Inness noted that while images of “tough women” are depicted in women’s magazines, they did not appear on the covers of the magazines and their toughness was undermined in a variety of ways. Toughness usually appeared as

a fantasy and as a sexual image, reinforcing the normative concept of women's roles as sex objects for men.⁴⁸ In her analysis, Inness noted that women's magazines "play an important role in helping to formulate gender in our culture," and quoted Naomi Wolf's theory that "women's magazines are the only products of popular culture that (unlike romances) change with women's reality, are mostly written by women for women about women's issues, and take women's concerns seriously."⁴⁹ Inness summarized her findings by stating, "women's magazines often use those images [of toughness] to affirm the desirability of femininity for women and to help maintain traditional gender divisions between men and women."⁵⁰ Inness' assessment of the depictions of "tough women" in magazines parallels the ideal "Teena" image that girls' magazines perpetuate. The differences in gender roles that are depicted, the desirability of femininity that is highlighted, and the persuasion to purchase and use products that will promote beautification are foundational similarities between girls' and women's magazines.

Kelly Schrum's "Teena Means Business': Teenage Girls' Culture and *Seventeen* Magazine, 1944-1950" reviewed the role *Seventeen* magazine played in the formation of the age and gender segmented market in the post-World War II era. Schrum's article included a variety of sources related to the magazine, including editorial content, advertising, letters, marketing information provided to advertisers, and survey information collected by the magazine's staff. She highlighted the fact that the magazine's readers were mostly white middle- and upper-class girls, while "*Seventeen* claimed to be the voice of the aggregate

population of teenage girls and declared itself the cultural mediator between the 'American teenage girl' and advertisers, manufacturers, and mass media in general."⁵¹ Schrum also described the concept of "civic consumerism," which combined "one's democratic role as active citizen with one's duty as a responsible and active consumer." Schrum argued that *Seventeen* promoted both of these ideals, while cultivating insecurity and the constant need for personal improvement and taming girls' sexuality.⁵² In "Teena Means Business," Schrum supported Grace Palladino's depiction of the influence that *Seventeen* and Eugene Gilbert had over youth culture and social norms.

Kelly Schrum's *Some Wore Bobby Sox: The Emergence of Teenage Girls' Culture, 1920-1945* brought together many of the arguments addressed in the previously critiqued sources while disputing some of the interpretations addressed in others. Schrum's sources included editorial content and advertising from magazines, as well as yearbooks, diaries, letters, research studies, industry newsletters, and catalogs. Schrum argued that the dramatic increase in high school attendance, influenced by compulsory education laws, was the single most important factor in the development of teen culture. Within high schools, teenagers "discovered an unprecedented opportunity to develop friendships and peer culture free from adult control." This peer culture was especially important for girls, "promoting conformity and age-specific norms and allowing for the development and dissemination of teenage culture."⁵³ Schrum argued that the roots of youth culture were established as early as the 1920s, predating by decades the generally assumed start of a distinct youth or teenage culture,

paralleling the rise of consumer culture in the post-World War II era. However, the development of teenage girls' culture was "uneven" between 1920 and 1945, as "change within various industries – fashion, commercial beauty products, music, and movies – happened at different times... Some industries attempted to shape the teenage market; others remained unaware as teenage girls became major purchasers of their goods."⁵⁴ Schrum summarized the role of girls in establishing their own teenage girls' culture as "they utilized the materials of popular culture to do so, reshaping adult or multi-generational products into teen-centered trends."⁵⁵

Schrum cited several significant influences in shaping the lives and socialization of teenage girls. "Advice literature and advertisements shaped the lives of teenage girls... literature for female adolescents addressed behavior, appearance, and relationships, promoting domestic skills and consumer goods." However, she also noted that, "media messages created new problems for girls, fostering anxieties and providing a language for insecurities."⁵⁶ These statements indicate that the media were perpetuating imagery of gender roles and fostering insecurities in girls to encourage continued consumption long before the publication of *Seventeen* or any other girls' magazines. As Schrum outlined these concepts, as she noted that "Advice literature created a complex set of guidelines and mixed messages, telling girls to focus on attracting and pleasing boys but to avoid becoming 'boy crazy' or too serious about one boyfriend... This was often related to feelings about clothing and beauty, such as whether or not an outfit would attract a certain boy..."⁵⁷ These statements identify the normative gender

roles and socialization required for girls as outlined by the media, including male domination and the necessity of beautification for success. These arguments are utilized in the content analyses previously addressed in this review, revealing that the methods used to socialize girls into conformist roles in the early twentieth century were still utilized in the late twentieth century (and still are today).

In outlining how the teenage girls' consumer culture was shaped, Schrum indicated, "Manufacturers, retailers, and advertisers focused their attention on high school girls. Girls were active consumers, searching for fashions that met their needs, pursuing commercial beauty products and popular culture before being targeted as a market distinct from adults or adult women." Echoing the theories of Eugene Gilbert, Schrum stated, "Girls were influenced by industry attention to their consuming habits, but they also shaped that attention and demanded that other industries notice them."⁵⁸ Schrum provided a wealth of research and interpretations that establish the development of girls' culture and its impact on various business industries, such as department stores, magazines, and beauty products. In the 1920s, "the message that clothes did make the woman remained a popular theme in advice literature and fashion magazines, however, and was frequently reflected in studies of girls' self-perception."⁵⁹ These fashion magazines were created for women, but were circulated among girls too. This encouraged *Parents* magazine to develop columns specifically addressing girls' issues, which "encouraged mothers to accept fads because they promoted beauty culture and kept daughters interested in appearance."⁶⁰ The importance of image and fashion in forming normative ideals for teenage girls

clearly appeared before the publication of magazines expressly for girls, and the perpetuation of idealized beauty standards already was established as an accepted cultural convention for American women *and* girls by the 1940s. Schrum actually established that these standards were accepted in the 1920s, as “highly perfected images of beauty began to shape women’s expectations and use of cosmetics... Makeup did not have one uniform meaning for girls of all racial, ethnic, and class backgrounds, but for many high school girls it signified an opportunity to strengthen peer ties and to look older...”⁶¹ Even though cosmetics were not yet developed for a teenage audience, girls adapted products designed for adult women to suit their needs. This statement also highlights that the idealized beauty norms were those of white, middle class women.

Some Wore Bobby Sox provided an overview of the development of teenage girls’ culture in the inter-war era in America, with Schrum arguing that this culture began developing much earlier than most historians acknowledge, and that girls themselves had a very influential role in shaping their culture, including the advertising and products that were designed for them. These arguments disputed those made by others evaluated in this review, and indicate that there are several ways to analyze and interpret the messages received by teenage girls from the media and society. In the conclusion of *Some Wore Bobby Sox*, Kelly Schrum outlined the factors that she believed shaped the creation of a gendered teenage culture. “Beyond consumption, it is also a story of identity formation, gender, stages of life, the importance of institutions, and induction into mainstream norms of femininity, commercial beauty, consumer

culture, romance, and marriage. Nationally and individually, identity formation and market formation occurred together.”⁶²

While not cultural scholars nor academic critics, Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields, Gloria Stavers’s protégés and successors as editors of *16 Magazine* upon her departure, provided the most pertinent secondary source material specific to this project in their 1997 book, *Who’s Your Fave Rave?* Filled with reminiscences and assessments of Gloria Stavers from the pop stars who were the “fave raves” featured in the magazine, *Who’s Your Fave Rave?* was Reisfeld and Fields’s tribute to their mentor and the magazine itself. While their adoration for Stavers was evident, they provided insightful information about Stavers’s relationships with pop stars and the behind-the-scenes editorial processes that were essential for this analysis. Reisfeld and Fields wrote that *16 Magazine* was the first magazine “to capture that fantastical celebrity magic for a very specific teenage audience” and that “[fantasy] is what the magazine was built on... a rosy version of some parts of the truth.”⁶³ *Who’s Your Fave Rave?* provided essential data regarding *16 Magazine*’s publication, as well as numerous anecdotes from the teen idols who worked closely with – or at the behest of – Gloria Stavers during her years as editor. As Reisfeld and Fields closed their introductory section on Gloria Stavers, they proclaimed, “This book, dedicated to Gloria’s memory, is her legacy, along with dreams counted in the millions.”⁶⁴

Theories relating to consumer culture, media influences on girls, the functions of pop music and its stars within girl culture, and magazines that are marketed to girls all inform the analysis that follows. However, *16 Magazine* had

a very unique influence on teen girl culture. Gloria Stavers's editorial control, refusal to accept outside advertising, and inclusion of readers' contributions allowed *16 Magazine* to function in 1960s American girl culture as a comfortable space free of overt consumer pressures in which girls could negotiate expectations and fantasize about their desires - their own private "Dreamsville." Nonetheless, Stavers' dominance over the content of *16 Magazine* encouraged girls to identify with, and replicate, expected social norms of the era – and become consumers that were beneficial, in terms of both profit and popularity, to the magazine and its featured stars. Propelled by the popularity of *American Bandstand*, the British Invasion, and American responses in the forms of Paul Revere & the Raiders and The Monkees, *16 Magazine* ultimately reached millions of American girls every month through the 1960s – with its influences instilled far beyond the era itself.

NOTES

1. Gloria Stavers, quoted in John Burks and Jerry Hopkins, *Groupies and Other Girls* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), 98.
2. Richard Ohmann, *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century* (London: Verso, 1996), 238.
3. Ellen Gruber Garvey, *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 43.
4. Garvey, 5.
5. Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 119.
6. Susan J. Douglas, *Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media* (New York: Times Books, 1995), 245.
7. Douglas, 251.
8. Grace Palladino, "Swing Shift: Bobby Soxers Take the Stage," in *Teenagers* (New York: BasicBooks, 1996), 52.
9. Palladino, 53-54.
10. Palladino, 108.
11. Kathy Peiss, "Identity and the Market," in *Hope in a Jar: The Making of America's Beauty Culture* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998), 238.
12. Peiss, 245-246.
13. Peiss, 251-253.
14. Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel, *The Popular Arts* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1964), 269.
15. Hall and Whannel, 410.
16. Hall and Whannel, 413.
17. Hall and Whannel, 20.

-
18. Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (New York: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1979), 17-18.
 19. In the early 1970s, *16 Magazine* published a few issues of *Loving Fashions* magazine, which fared poorly and quickly ceased publication.
 20. Simon Frith, *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock 'n' Roll* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), 227.
 21. Frith, 226.
 22. Frith, 227-228.
 23. Frith, 228-231.
 24. Frith, 226.
 25. Angela McRobbie, *Feminism and Youth Culture: From "Jackie" to "Just Seventeen"* (Cambridge, MA: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1991), 81-82.
 26. McRobbie, 87.
 27. McRobbie, 90-91.
 28. McRobbie, 126.
 29. McRobbie, 126.
 30. McRobbie, 131.
 31. Ilana Nash, "Hysterical Scream or Rebel Yell? The Politics of Teen-Idol Fandom," in *Disco Divas: Women and Popular Culture in the 1970s*, ed. Sherrie A. Inness (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 133.
 32. Nash, 133-134.
 33. Nash, 136, 138.
 34. Nash, 142.
 35. Nash, 142.
 36. Nash, 149.

-
37. Kelly Schrum, "'Teena Means Business': Teenage Girls' Culture and 'Seventeen' Magazine, 1944-1950," in *Delinquents & Debutantes: Twentieth-Century American Girls' Cultures*, ed. Sherrie A. Inness (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 134.
38. Laura M. Carpenter, "From Girls into Women: Scripts for Sexuality and Romance in Seventeen Magazine, 1974-1994," *Journal of Sex Research* 35:2 (May 1998), online edition (no page numbers provided).
39. Carpenter.
40. Ana Garner, Helen M. Sterk, and Shawn Adams, "Narrative Analysis of Sexual Etiquette in Teenage Magazines," *Journal of Communication* 48:4 (Autumn 1998), 59. The magazines used in their analysis are *YM*, *Teen*, *Seventeen*, *Glamour*, and *Mademoiselle*.
41. Garner, Sterk, and Adams, 71.
42. Sharon R. Mazzarella, "The 'Superbowl of All Dates': Teenage Girl Magazines and the Commodification of the Perfect Prom" in *Growing Up Girls: Popular Culture and Construction of Identity*, ed. Sharon R. Mazzarella and Norma Odom Pecora (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999), 107.
43. Mazzarella, 101, 109.
44. Mary Celeste Kearney, "Producing Girls: Rethinking the Study of Female Youth Culture," in *Delinquents and Debutantes: Twentieth-Century Girls' Culture*, ed. Sherrie A. Inness (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 287-288.
45. Kearney, 289.
46. Kearney, 304.
47. Kearney, 305.
48. Sherrie A. Inness, "Pretty Tough: The Cult of Femininity in Women's Magazines," in *Tough Girls: Women Warriors and Wonder Women in Popular Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 50-51.
49. Inness, 51.
50. Inness, 53.

-
51. Schrum, "Teena," 139.
 52. Schrum, "Teena," 149.
 53. Kelly Schrum, *Some Wore Bobby Sox: The Emergence of Teenage Girls' Culture, 1920-1945* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 13-14.
 54. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 5.
 55. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 6.
 56. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 16.
 57. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 17.
 58. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 19.
 59. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 27.
 60. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 47.
 61. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 70.
 62. Schrum, *Bobby Sox*, 171.
 63. Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields, *Who's Your Fave Rave?* (New York: Boulevard Books, 1997), vii, x.
 64. Reisfeld and Fields, xi.

**Democracy, Duty, and Dreams:
The Cultural Climate at *16 Magazine's* Inception**

“You are the proud owner of Nature’s greatest creations – the components that make up a complete human being ... Isn’t it almost a *duty* to take everything you have and develop it to its shiny best?” – Gloria Stavers¹

In many ways, the ideologies that dominated political and social discourses in the United States during the Cold War era simplified issues into a series of binary oppositions. Much as the political axes of Democracy and Communism were positioned as binary opposites of good and evil, or perhaps more specifically American and anti-American, so were the ancillary domestic social ideologies of the era. Ingrained institutions of American life, including the federal government, organized Christian religions, the education system, and the media, perpetuated this concise, rigid, systematic method of reflecting and influencing American society. While the presidential administrations of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon pursued aggressive political and military policies to protect and extend capitalist democracy, institutional ideologues reinforced domestic containment agendas with characteristics that paralleled the prevailing political ideologies of the era. These strict agendas, veiled with emotional rhetoric of fear and hope, reinforced normative behaviors that instilled a conformist framework for social relations, simplifying the recognition of deviant activities and realigning social relations in the United States, most specifically concerning gender, generation, and sexuality.

Following the interpretations of Elaine Tyler May, Lizabeth Cohen, Lynn Peril, Beth Bailey, and Susan Douglas, my analysis emphasizes the rigidity within mass-mediated texts aimed at girls in the postwar era and the persuasion to adhere to the roles and behaviors promoted within those texts. Picking up where their elucidations and analyses left off, I will assess specific literature aimed at girls during this same time frame, notably the advice literature of Betty Betz and early teen magazines. While plentiful evidence indicates that many American girls did not act in accord with the prescribed roles and behaviors that mass media perpetuated, the purpose here is not to explore the contrary actions of girls nor their agency within and beyond the parameters emphasized during this era. Instead, my focus is on how previously unanalyzed texts functioned in this era, texts that were marketed primarily to white, middle-class girls. My framework is informed by the unique nature of the “rigidity” in this era, especially as it pertains to gender and generational roles. The binaries that existed between female and male, as well as between baby boomers and their parents, followed patterns long established in American culture; however, the introduction of television in American homes, along with the reinforcement of a mass-market consumer culture, intensified the established differences between these gender and generational categories. Americans were bombarded with these differences anytime they turned on a television set, read a mass-market publication, or went shopping. Beyond their leisure time, they faced these distinctions in their schools, workplaces, and other institutional settings.

After World War II, the United States and Soviet Union emerged as dominant global powers with distinct spheres of influence. The oppositions between American capitalist democracy and Soviet communism were clarified politically and socially throughout American culture, where the nuclear family was promoted as the best defense against deviant threats. Political and social rhetoric characterized Soviet communism as a God-less, oppressive regime that prohibited prosperity, stunted individual achievement, and rejected Christian values. To protect the United States from infiltration by this antithetical menace, American social and cultural institutions reinforced rigid gender and generational roles and behaviors as a means to protect American ethics and values and to prevent and/or expose deviance. A properly structured nuclear family could establish and perpetuate normative behaviors in support of American ideologies, as well as protect impressionable youth from the temptations of subversive infiltrators. The American family served as a microcosm of American society as a whole, in which heterosexual partnerships, distinct gender and generational roles, responsible consumerism, and respect for authority would ensure protection against covert Communist intrusions into American society and culture.

As the oppositions between normative and deviant behaviors and ideologies were established and promoted throughout American culture, perceived links between social deviance and the Communist menace were established as well. The dominant normative agendas that reinforced the ideal of the white, middle class, Christian nuclear family thus marginalized Americans

who did not correspond to that ideal. Non-white, ethnic, and African-American populations, working-class laborers, non-Christians, and homosexuals were among those considered subversive or “threatening” and were targeted for surveillance, both formally by the government and informally within their communities. At accelerated rates, white middle class families moved to suburbs that were characterized by conformity and containment, while the potentially threatening populations remained in urban areas, which generated additional scrutiny. Thus, the institutional ideologies that rigidly defined “American” in opposition to “Communist” also generated fear of any non-normative behavior or characteristic as deviant and threatening.

The crucial binary oppositions that affected American social relations in the Cold War era essentially were rooted in the roles and responsibilities of the nuclear middle-class family, where clearly defined roles and behaviors for heterosexual males and females, husbands and wives, and parents and children were inculcated. These binary oppositions were not designated as good and evil, but perceived as distinct positions that complemented each other when practiced appropriately; deviation from these normative roles and behaviors would produce discord and/or threaten American domestic defense against subversion. In the domestic, private sphere, parents were responsible for modeling and teaching normative social ideologies of obligation and responsibility, such as patriotism, consumerism, and deference to authority, while schools and popular media replicated the messages among youth when they were in the public sphere, beyond the watchful eyes of their parents. Additionally, schools and media

reinforced these ideologies among the “subversive” populations, indicating the behaviors they could practice to align with the dominant conformist agendas. American culture intertwined these social ideologies with the rigidly defined normative gender, generational, and sexuality roles enforced by political and social ideologues to establish clearly defined conformist social relations from the 1940s through the 1970s.

As men returned from wartime military duty in the late 1940s, transitions in the workplace relegated many women back to the home as men reclaimed their jobs in the public sector. Patriotic principles emphasizing the defense of American democracy and capitalism assigned men the responsibilities of defending these institutions in the public sphere and relegated women to defending them in the domestic sphere. While women’s service in the labor force was appreciated and needed as a patriotic wartime home-front effort, their continued participation in the labor force was rejected for several reasons. As men sought employment, they were given preferential status for most positions as they were socially determined to be the breadwinners upon whom their families depended financially and structurally. In addition, the dominant social ideology reinforced the crucial roles of women in the domestic sphere, reinforcing normative behaviors in the private sector. Echoing the 19th century ideology of “True Womanhood,” women were expected to be teachers in the home, instructing their children in the proper behaviors of citizenship and consumerism while keeping a watchful eye on them playing in the living room or backyard. As wartime industries were transitioned into the production of consumer goods,

these distinctions became even more critical; the American economy depended upon responsible consumerism, which women could best model and reinforce within the home. In addition, the business world became a rigidly structured environment as well, with the conformist “organization man” as its symbolic representation. The emasculating characteristics of this business culture reinforced the importance of distinct gender roles in the home, where men could assert their individual authority and dominance with supportive wives and obedient children.²

The significance of this masculine/feminine binary opposition permeated American society and became much more entrenched by the early 1960s, perpetuated by popular media depictions of families and the ethics of consumerism that were incorporated into every facet of American life. The public depictions of the Kennedy White House reinforced normative gender roles and behaviors, as the media-friendly family allowed unprecedented access to their private lives. First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy served as a deferential wife and mother, displayed a fashionable feminine image, and gained accolades for her consumer-friendly redecoration of the White House, which she displayed to a national television audience. Meanwhile, President John Kennedy asserted his masculine leadership and decision-making skills as he pursued aggressive anti-Communist military policies; his private dalliances with a variety of women would later underscore his rampant masculine sexuality as well.

The infamous Nixon-Khrushchev “Kitchen Debate” at the American Exhibition in Moscow in 1959 was another very prominent political exposition of

these interwoven gender and consumer ideologies. As Vice President Richard Nixon emphasized the variety and quality of American consumer goods as a representation of the strength and superiority of capitalism and democracy, he also underscored how consumer culture defended these institutions. In this “consumers’ republic,” the variety of goods available to consumers symbolized the ideals of prosperity and the right of individual choice, while it underscored the values of industrial research and development. The emphasis of a postwar economy sustained by mass consumption highlighted the ideological integration of economic abundance and democratic political principles. In addition, Nixon proudly extolled the advanced technology of the model household appliances that were “designed to make things easier for our women.” Thus, in a highly contested public discussion establishing the oppositional binary values of American capitalist democracy and Soviet communism, the normative roles of women in the home were highlighted and emphasized as integral to the success of American ideologies.³

Consumerism enhanced the physical expression of defined gender roles and behaviors as well. The fashion, beauty, and cosmetics industries thrived in this consumer culture, as consumer products designed to enhance femininity became more acceptable and, in fact, encouraged. Visible enhancements to simultaneously emphasize and contain feminine physique and sexuality became fashion standards; bras, girdles, waist-cinchers, and panty hose became essential items to wear underneath high-fashion designs that enhanced the ideal feminine “hourglass” shape. The beauty and cosmetics industries marketed their

products as signifiers of feminine identity and self-fulfillment, completing the public image of the feminine woman as well as the self-image of the compliant woman who fulfilled her gendered responsibilities. The consumer choices women made with regards to beauty products – whether they chose the glamorous Revlon “Fire and Ice” collection or “clean look” of Cover Girl – revealed how they perceived themselves as well as how they wanted to project themselves in public.⁴

Of course, public standards also dictated that men project themselves in conformist heterosexual ways that enhanced their masculinity as well; this also was achieved through consumer practices. The white-collar business uniform, stereotypically the “grey flannel suit,” was a signifier of a man’s status and role in the public sphere. The car he drove, the cigarettes he smoked, the liquor he preferred, and the suburb in which he lived were all clear indications of what type of man he was, as perpetuated by popular media advertisements. Men’s magazines increased in circulation during the Cold War era, countering the popular women’s magazines that had been in circulation since the nineteenth century. *Esquire* and *Gentleman’s Quarterly* were early successes among men’s magazines, but the introduction of *Playboy* encouraged consumerism among men at unprecedented levels. These magazines, to varying levels, depicted trendy fashions, electronic goods, and status signifiers that presumably would attract throngs of women; married men could fantasize about these opportunities, while single men could aspire to achieve the utopian images depicted in the features.⁵

The television industry was integral to the reinforcement of dominant American ideologies during the Cold War era, perpetuating normative gender and generational roles and behaviors as well as extending the discourses of consumerism, containment, and Christian values directly into homes across the United States. Federal regulations and oversight ensured that that messages and images depicted on network television aligned with the dominant political and social ideologies of the era. The most obvious example of this practice was the family situation comedy, in which a white middle-class suburban family dealt with a problem or conflict that was resolved within a half-hour. These situations usually involved a mildly rebellious teenager, an overzealous wife, or an overextended father; the resolutions were reached when the family members realigned into their proper gender and generational roles. Popular shows such as *I Love Lucy*, *Father Knows Best*, *Leave It To Beaver*, *The Donna Reed Show*, and *My Three Sons* repeated these formulas for many years, consistently underscoring the satisfaction achieved by practicing conformist normative behaviors while exposing the potential consequences of deviating from those behaviors. In addition, sitcoms promoted responsible consumer behavior and depicted how contributing to the mass consumption economy indicated patriotic, democratic participation in American society.⁶ The longevity and legacies of these shows in syndicated reruns extended the messages and images for generations.

Television advertising reinforced the responsible consumer ethic in American culture in commercials and with product placement and endorsements

within the narratives of television shows. Game shows demonstrated how individual achievement could offer the bounties afforded by capitalism, while designating consumer goods as rewards for skill and/or intelligence. However, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen presented the most overt and direct rejection of communism itself in his Emmy award-winning series *Life Is Worth Living*. Sheen's direct attacks against God-less communists were reiterated in his Catholic sermons on national broadcast television throughout the 1950s and in syndication thereafter. Sheen was a commanding personality with theatric flair, and his prime-time sermons instilled fear of Communist infiltration. However, he also declared that the possibilities of redemption were available to those who had diverted from Christian principles; thus, a deviant who had wavered from normative society could still find redemption if he realigned himself with, and conformed to, Christian – and American – values and behaviors.⁷

The dominant political and social ideologies in the United States during the Cold War era incorporated another key binary opposition, that of adult and youth. This generational opposition incorporated rigidly defined roles and responsibilities based on age and maturity; adults were the authoritarian decision-makers who modeled conformist normative political and social behaviors, while youth were the obedient trainees upon whom the hopes and aspirations for the perpetuation of American capitalism and democracy were pinned. The dominant ideologies of patriotism, consumerism, and conformity were to be introduced in the nuclear family, but also were promulgated through formal education and the popular media. Formal education provided structure not

only for curriculum, but also for social behavior. While young schoolchildren were subject to the authority of school administrations, university administrations functioned under the “in loco parentis” mode, serving in proxy parental and surveillance roles. This approach was intended to socialize students into white middle class normative behaviors, and induced much resistance from the students themselves.⁸

As technological competition with the Soviet Union increased during the Cold War, the federal government endorsed measures that would provide America’s youth with the opportunities and responsibilities to challenge Soviet technical education and advancement. Federal funding supported additional science and technology education for school children, and the Congressional National Defense Education Act authorized low-interest, long-term student loans for college students. In addition, the Kennedy Administration initiated increased funding for space and technology research in support of NASA’s efforts to extend space exploration and reach the moon before the Soviet Union. Thus, the Cold War extended to the final frontier of space exploration, and political leaders instilled their hope in American students to achieve those patriotic, dutiful goals.⁹

President Kennedy boldly announced in his inaugural address that “the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans,” and he did not discriminate between boys and girls. Not only were children considered an integral part of defending American capitalism and democracy, they were initiated into the normative behaviors that would strongly defend these ideologies at an earlier age than their parents’ generation was. Advertisers and media

executives directed much of their promotional budgets towards the younger generation, consumers-in-training who had significant amounts of disposable income and lots of leisure time in which to spend it. While instilling a strong consumer ethic among youth, these executives also incorporated messages that aligned with dominant discourses of gender, generation, and sexuality into their products. G.I. Joe and Barbie became popular toys with which younger children could grow acclimated to gender roles and behavior – the overtly masculine patriotic soldier and the overtly feminine “bombshell” who prided herself on her wardrobe and accessories. Meanwhile, older children were indoctrinated into a consumer society that provided an inordinate amount of goods that served as expressions of identity and signifiers within their peer culture. A young person’s preferred fashions, cosmetics, records, comic books, magazines, radios and stereo equipment, cars, and a wide variety of other consumer goods became integral taste and style signifiers among their peers and for adults, while also serving as indicators of social status. In addition, the advertising lexicon of the era adopted the youthful state of mind as an ideal, which could be acquired through consumer activity. Aligning with the political and ideological hopes attached to youth, consumer and popular culture also emphasized the leading role young people played in Cold War America.¹⁰

Of course, while youth were held as the torchbearers of hope and prosperity, they were inundated by messages cautioning them that they could achieve those goals only if they conformed to rigid gender and generational roles. These roles were enforced throughout the popular media, and especially

those media that claimed young people as a significant portion of their audiences. Television was especially effective at projecting these normative roles and behaviors throughout the Cold War era. As previously noted, television sitcoms presented the ideal nuclear family in which children often acted in a slightly deviant way, usually due to their inexperience or lack of impulse control, but were brought back in line with the parents' moral compass, which realigned the family with conformist roles. Youth-oriented television programming, from *Howdy Doody* and *Sesame Street* to *American Bandstand* and *The Mod Squad*, featured young people rehearsing decision-making, peer interaction, and interactivity with elders under the guidance and surveillance of authoritarian adults who structured the spaces in which the young people practiced these skills.

While rigid gender and generational roles and behaviors were integral to a conformist American society, both of these social structures enforced normative sexuality as well. The binary opposition of heterosexuality and homosexuality aligned much closer to the axes of good and evil than complementary binaries of gender and generation. Heterosexuality was essential to the promulgation of the ideal nuclear family; homosexuality was not only antithetical to the norm, but also was perceived and approached as subversively threatening deviant behavior. Political and social ideologues argued that links between political and sexual perversion easily were established, especially since the "low morality" of homosexuals undermined the structure of the nuclear family and Christian values and thus threatened American democracy as well. Homosexuality was

considered such a threat to American ideals and ideologies that it was one of the primary foci of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). HUAC's most notorious investigations focused on rooting out and exposing Communist sympathizers in Hollywood in the late 1940s, but the committee also pursued known homosexuals in the Truman Administration's State Department. HUAC accused these individuals of falling prey to deviant behavior and, as such, being likely targets for and/or sympathizers with communists.¹¹

Socially, young people generally congregated in homosocial groups until they began dating, at which point their roles as future spouses and parents became more critical for perpetuating American democratic strength than their youthful aspirations. Social ideologies did not exactly discourage teenage sexual practices during the Cold War era, so long as the activities were practiced within a relationship headed towards marriage. Sexual activity just for fun was not condoned, however, and girls carried the responsibilities for halting such behavior due to their supposed stricter moral fortitude and boys' presumed naturally aggressive masculine behavior. Therefore, as dating moved away from domestic courting and into the public sphere, fueled by consumer culture and financial accessibility, surveillance by peers and elder authority was employed to prevent deviation from normative behaviors.¹²

While this analysis defines the normative roles and behaviors that were dictated by political and social agendas during the Cold War era, significant resistance to these conformist ideologies became prevalent during the 1960s and 1970s. As youth peer culture became more prominent and coherent, young

people resisted the massive expectations and restrictions placed upon them. The student rights and free speech movements coalesced in vocal and visible retaliation against the “in loco parentis” university administrations, providing some politicians with ammunition to support exactly why they believed youth required such pervasive supervision. The escalation of troop deployments to Vietnam underscored the expectations placed upon young men to defend capitalism and democracy against communism, yet incited strong opposition among the youth who were directly affected by the draft and argued that they should have a voice in the political system that sent them to defend and extend democracy. Such strong reactions against the military action in Vietnam perpetuated political critiques that anti-war protesters were Communist sympathizers. Feminist movements of middle class women retaliated against their confinement to the domestic sphere, fueled by the insightful commentaries of Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem on the dissatisfactory plights of this “privileged” group. The shake-up in structured gendered roles allowed the gay rights movement to gain momentum as well, signified by the iconic Stonewall protest in 1969 and the disco culture of the 1970s. Beyond these internal resistance movements, numerous racial and ethnic movements, including the civil rights, Black Power, Red Power, and Nuyorican movements, cohered to fight for equal rights and considerations afforded to the idealized white middle class throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

Political and social discourses of the Cold War era reinforced normative roles and behaviors, emphasizing strict conformity to established ideals that were

best represented by the white middle class family. Deviance from these roles and behaviors allowed entry to subversive ideologies that could undermine capitalism and democracy. Communism was the oppositional evil threat, which could infiltrate and topple American institutions if deviance from socially and culturally constructed norms was attempted. The consequences of these dominant ideologies were rigidly defined gender, generational, and sexual roles and behaviors, promulgated by government, organized Christian religion, education, and popular media institutions. Though perpetuated socially and culturally throughout the Cold War era, tensions among, and resistance to, these contained roles and behaviors existed throughout the era and gained significant momentum in its later decades.

Literature of the Era

The first issue of *16 Magazine* was published in May 1957, and the magazine was published every two months through 1959. As Gloria Stavers took over the editorial helm of the magazine in late 1959, major changes in content, features, and style became evident and *16 Magazine* became a monthly publication. The cultural milieu that *16 Magazine* joined at its inception was rife with the discourses previously discussed. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, American intellectual and popular culture reflected broad concerns and discourses of the Cold War era, especially those involving gender and generational roles and behaviors. Common themes in accordance with the era's social and political emphases on democracy, conformity, and consumerism

emerged in these texts, with particular roles and “assignments” designated for children and teenagers. Representative works of this era include popular non-fiction works written by Vance Packard and Richard Hofstadter, advice literature for teenagers written by Betty Betz, and popular mainstream magazines targeting teenage girls, including *Seventeen* and *Teen Magazine*.

In the late 1950s, the earliest baby boomers were entering their immediate pre-teen years, becoming a population of millions which we would now identify as the “tween” demographic. These children were nearing adolescence during an era when the television industry was discovering the depth and breadth of its reach and influence; when popular music was facing crises of identity, as the earliest rock ‘n’ roll stars were disappearing due to questionable behaviors and even death; when popular non-fiction literature was utilizing psychology as a primary methodology, playing off the fears of parents concerned with their own roles and responsibilities; and when American society was coping with its greatest social struggles in nearly a century. The cultural milieu amidst which these children were maturing was in flux, a confusing stage upon which values and mores were negotiated and gender and generational roles were debated and enforced.

Suspicion and paranoia cloaked American society; though Senator Joseph McCarthy’s accusations of Communist subversives running rampant in the government and across the nation’s communities were deemed invalid, the lingering effects of such a possibility – that anti-American sympathizers could be installed in any facet of American life - terrified many. While politicians and

economists weighed the global ramifications of Cold War legislation and foreign policy decisions, parents and children contended with the paranoia and uncertainty in their daily lives. Some tackled it head-on by reinforcing traditional American values in their own lives; others looked to experts and professionals for advice on how to maintain continuity in a rapidly changing world. Regardless of the position of the individual, the popular culture texts of this era informed, even persuaded, the “average” American of the best course of action to defend freedom and democracy.

Conformity is one of the predominant themes of the Cold War era; applied to a wide variety of social and cultural trends, conforming to a prescribed aesthetic or image would assure an individual of “fitting in,” of showing his or her allegiance and adherence to striving for the American Dream, or simply showing that his or her tastes were in alignment with what was popular at the time. Conforming to an acceptable standard of dress, behavior, or even occupation could assure an individual of being free from suspicion of subversion – whether such subversion was sympathizing with Communists or juvenile delinquency. The social and cultural norms to which Americans were expected to adhere differed depending on their age and gender, but always returned to the same core value: upholding the ideals of capitalism and democracy in defiance of Soviet communism. As the Cold War continued, it was considered not only the responsibility of a “good American” to be a savvy consumer and citizen, but the *duty* of the “good American” to actively support and reinforce the established norms for their particular demographic. Therefore, adult men and women had

specific expectations based on masculine and feminine gendered roles as husbands and wives, fathers and mothers; young people also faced such expectations, as obedient children, dedicated students, and heterosexually curious (but inactive) romantic partners.

In today's highly social and public culture, it might be difficult to ascertain exactly what, if any, the social and cultural expectations of individuals are, given the variety of media Americans are subjected to and participate in. However, an uncanny consistency emerges in an analysis of the mainstream intellectual and cultural climate of the late 1950s and early 1960s; whether assessing popular non-fiction literature, advice from social and psychological "experts," television personalities, or teen magazines, certain blueprints for the American Dream emerge, complete with gendered roles and behaviors, rampant consumer desires, and career aspirations – all of which would work in cohesion to provide a solid defense against the threats of the sprawling "Communist Menace."

Turning first to non-fiction literature, a distinct trend appears upon reviewing the New York Times' bestseller lists from the late 1950s and early 1960s. Books that delved into the themes of surveillance, authority, and communism were among the top sellers, and books from social and psychology "experts" were at the top of the sales charts. While works such as *The FBI Story*, *Inside Russia Today*, and J. Edgar Hoover's *Masters of Deceit* sold well, one author laid claim to three best-sellers within three years: Vance Packard.

Packard, a journalist and social critic, wrote three of the seminal works of this era: *The Hidden Persuaders*, *The Status Seekers*, and *The Waste Makers*,

all published between 1957 and 1960. Each of these books tied into the themes of consumer behavior and its impact on social status. In *The Hidden Persuaders*, Packard investigated the manipulative tactics used by the marketing and advertising industries to instill desires and persuade consumers to buy products – and, perhaps more telling, buy into certain ideas. Packard’s critical revelations regarding the marketing of politicians and popular entertainment stars were especially enlightening – in his analysis, he revealed that these personalities are treated as any other consumer products, and the same manipulative tactics used to sell cars, washing machines, and new fashions to consumers are used to “sell” political candidates to voters and pop music stars to children. In essence, the consumer culture of post-war America was not relegated to manufactured goods; instead, Americans were being “sold” what they believed were their independent choices in representation and taste. Their options were limited to what the backers – whether of goods, politicians, or entertainers – determined would be available, creating a market-based society that enforced consumerism in every aspect of decision-making.

Packard’s *The Status Seekers* continued with some of these themes and critiques, but refocused the readers’ attention on how consumer behaviors and choices can affect said consumer’s image amongst his neighbors, co-workers, and social peers. In *The Waste Makers*, Packard explored a theme he introduced in *The Hidden Persuaders*, planned obsolescence – the conscious process of making a product obsolete or outdated within a specified timeframe planned by the manufacturer. In *The Hidden Persuaders*, Packard noted this process not so

much with regards to household appliances or trends in clothing (though those types of goods clearly are addressed as such), but most effectively with regard to pop stars who are marketed to young people. In the chapter entitled “The Psycho-Seduction of Children,” Packard addressed one of the hallmarks of this era.

One aspect of juvenile merchandising that intrigued the depth manipulators was the craze or fad ... Mr. Politz [a motivational expert] pointed out that crazes take a course from upper to lower. In the case of adult fads this means upper-income education groups to lower. In the case of children, Politz explained: “Those children who are leaders because of their age adopt the fad first and then see it picked up by the younger children, an age class they no longer wish to be identified with. This causes the older children deliberately to drop the fad.” Both Politz and Dichter [another motivational expert] felt not only that with careful planning the course of fads could be charted to ensure more profits to everybody, but also that profitable fads could actually be created.¹³

Another writer who claimed several top sellers during this era was historian Richard Hofstadter. In his most widely-read and critically acclaimed works, Hofstadter utilized a methodology which applied social psychology concepts to explain political history, and argued that historical periods should be understood as products of *consensus* rather than conflict. With this methodology, Hofstadter focused on some of the era’s key discourses – social status anxiety, anti-intellectualism, paranoia, and fear – as explanations for historical events and trends in the past. By focusing on common elements amongst Americans in any historical era, and finding themes in the past that replicated contemporary discourses, Hofstadter implicitly highlighted the *conformity* of Americans to certain ideals in their respective eras. Moreover, by revealing such continuity, he presented his audience with “evidence” that the majority (silent or not) in most

eras coped with the same concerns and fears as his contemporary audience did. In other words, to be paranoid, suspicious, and eyeing your neighbors over your shoulder were not unusual to the Cold War era.

Hofstadter's most famous and widely read analyses were published within a ten-year span and earned the historian two Pulitzer Prizes: *The Age of Reform* (1955), *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (1963), and *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (1965). The appeal of Hofstadter's works to mass audiences was in his focus not on the political leaders or legislative highlights of the movements, but in the *average American's* participation in and effect on the movements. By crafting his analyses in this way, Hofstadter could draw connections for his readers between their own lived experiences and those of Americans in past; in addition, he established themes of *continuity* which could reassure the reader that conforming to the prescribed trends and themes of the era was appropriate and, in fact, expected of a true American. To be clear, Hofstadter, like Packard, was not endorsing such conformity, but rather critiquing it. His exposure of the continuity within American historical trends was an effort to draw awareness to them and expose the hazards of persisting in a like fashion. Countering the ideologues' homogenizing agendas, Hofstadter and Packard brought to light the continual efforts, in business and politics, to craft a particular type of faithful, patriotic American who followed the conventions established by those in power.

Of course, works of social critics and historians appealed to a certain type of audience – generally middle-class, educated professionals who had the time

and desire to read such works. This demographic found another type of literature, advice from social and medical “experts,” particularly appealing. Sales of books such as Norman Vincent Peale’s *The Power of Positive Thinking* and *Stay Alive Your Entire Life*; Bishop Fulton Sheen’s *Life Is Worth Living*; Rev. Billy Graham’s *The Secret of Happiness*; Frances Benton’s *Etiquette*; Abigail Van Buren’s *Dear Abby*; and numerous cookbooks and decorating guides reached the top of best-seller lists through the 1950s. However, in 1958, an intriguing entry emerged at the top of the *New York Times*’s non-fiction best-sellers list. Pat Boone’s *Twixt Twelve and Twenty*, an advice guide of life and love for teenagers, remained on the list for ten months.¹⁴ Pat Boone, the pop star known for his middle-of-the-road demeanor and inoffensive catalog of music, was the second highest charting artist of the 1950s, behind only Elvis Presley, according to *Billboard* magazine.¹⁵ One of the most notable aspects of Boone’s popular recordings was that he performed “whitewashed” versions of rhythm and blues songs originally performed by black artists, thus making them “safe” for the mainstream white baby-boomer audience. While Boone today is considered an icon of the conformist mindset of the late 1950s, a poll cited in Phillip Ennis’s *The Seventh Stream: The Emergence of Rock ‘n’ Roll in American Popular Music* noted that among high school students, Boone was preferred over Elvis Presley by a two-to-one ratio among boys and a three-to-one ratio among girls.¹⁶

Another notable teen authority from this era, Dick Clark, published *Your Happiest Years*, in 1959. Clark, the host and producer of *American Bandstand*, the popular after-school music and dance television show, was considered an

authority on teenage culture, as well as one of the baby-boomers' most vocal advocates and most respected authority figures. This book, another advice guide for youth, addressed many problems that teenagers might face, both as determined by their age and by the culture around them, as well as possible ways that youths could make their teen years happier and more profitable. As with most literature that focused on teens in this era, the assumption that they would soon enter college or pursue a career path, as well as marry and start a family of their own, informed most of the advice presented by Clark. Clark's book clearly reiterated the distinct gender and generational roles even in its chapter titles, among them "Separating the Men from the Boys" and "Something for the Girls." "Welcome to the Club" discusses teen peer culture, "Good Manners Are Good Sense" highlights behavioral norms, and "Teenagers and Parents *Can Be Friends*" presents suggestions on communication and mutual respect between generations.¹⁷

Both Boone and Clark were television personalities with loyal audiences; however, they were older individuals who were viewed more as relatable authority figures by young people, rather than peers who were living with the same struggles and concerns as their audiences. In December of 1958, *Life Magazine* presented a cover story on one of these peers: a young man who also was a television personality, but who had grown up along with his audience and coped with many of the same questions and concerns that they did, albeit in a multi-faceted public spotlight. Upheld as one of rock 'n' roll's first major superstars – and the young man most likely to replace the soon-to-be-obsolete

(due to his patriotic service in the U.S. Army) Elvis Presley – Ricky Nelson was anointed with a title crafted by the magazine to describe his place in youth culture: Teenage Idol. If we consider an “idol” to be an object of admiration, devotion, adoration, even worship, this newly coined phrase took on two distinct meanings: Nelson was considered such an object who was a teen himself, but he also served the teen population as an icon they could truly claim as their own. For one of the most widely circulated magazines in America to devote a cover story to a “teenage idol” indicates that this demographic warranted analysis and representation by mass-media producers on a scale which adolescents never had before.

Advice for Girls

The figure, both symbolic and literal, of the teenage girl was the center of convergence for several major developments during this era, especially the promotion of a popular media culture, conventions regarding gender and sexuality, and the evolution of consumer culture which focused on demographic, identity, and taste distinctions. These developments emerged gradually in the early decades of the century, but attained a visible and dominant influence in the 1950s and 1960s. During these decades, teenagers became an extremely valuable and volatile peer group promoted by the media, analyzed by institutional figureheads, courted by advertisers, and criticized by all three sectors. The malleable, undecipherable “teenager,” treated as a stereotype and stripped of individuality by society at large, was a culturally engaged consumer armed with

disposable income and erratic tastes who had matured beyond the subject of authoritative decisions of parents but had not yet emerged as a socially responsible adult. The instability of the teenager's interests and identity, contextualized by a culture that highly valued America's youth as the hopeful bearers of a safe and strong American democracy of the future, led major cultural producers to focus on the teen demographic as their primary audience, analytical subjects, and profit generators. However, the teenage girl was the most lucrative subject for these producers, as her role(s) in a rapidly changing and socially unstable American culture was most critical and highly contested.

Cultural producers represented and interpreted the symbolic figure of the teenage girl as a confused, frenetic, white, middle-class, young female, with all of the broader connotations associated with those terms. She was beyond the toys and carefree whims of childhood, but not savvy with the duties and responsibilities of womanhood. Her socially fractured figure was dispersed between her age-determined student and daughter roles and her gender-determined social roles as confidant and date for her female and male peers, respectively. In the midst of this disjunction, she was also in training to become a civic consumer, a future wife and mother struggling to comprehend the duties and responsibilities that defined these roles in an ever-changing social context permeated with fears of deviance and subversion. Her literal figure, her physical body, was highly contested as well, with her physical development on display and her emerging sexuality simultaneously encouraged and contained by the culture around her. Her physique, her clothing, and the beauty products she used

accentuated her socially and culturally enforced femininity, yet the social conventions that urged restraint in romantic relationships frowned upon her sexual maturation. The popular media promoted and perpetuated the chaos that surrounded the teenage girl, while it courted her as a young buyer of goods, which would ease her domestic responsibilities and signify her individual tastes while she engaged in leisure and entertainment activities.¹⁸

The popular media found an avid, receptive, and responsive audience in teenage girls, but also utilized them as effective subjects with whom they could represent and expound upon broader social concerns and challenges. This was especially true in another major media outlet, the teen magazine. *Seventeen* was the most widely circulated magazine for teens during the 1950s, catering to an audience consisting primarily of teenage girls while reinforcing social norms and conventions of the parent culture. *Seventeen* began publication in 1944, and its features generally addressed the latest fashions, commentary on contemporary social issues, advice for social relationships, and beauty tips. The magazine's producers used these features to reinforce the role of the "civic consumer" for teenage girls, instructing them on how best to serve the interests of their families, communities, and America at large by practicing smart home economics and invigorating the national economy with practical purchases while acting as a responsible citizen. The advertisers whose products were marketed in *Seventeen* often influenced the editorial features in the magazine; a common tactic was to highlight the importance of using a particular beauty product to accentuate a girl's femininity or style in an advice column, while the facing page featured an

advertisement for a specific brand of that product. By incorporating this persuasive purchasing pressure, *Seventeen* served as a guide for teenage girls in negotiating their roles as fashionable students, future wives and mothers, and responsible citizens, while becoming consumers who enhanced their femininity and individual style with a wide variety of advertised goods.¹⁹

Seventeen was just one of the platforms from which the final purveyor of American conformist values and mores to be discussed here, Betty Betz, presented her advice for America's youth. Betz, a young Midwestern writer, was a columnist for *Harper's Bazaar*, *Women's Home Companion*, and *Seventeen* in the late 1940s and 1950s. She also published a number of successful advice and etiquette books for teenagers in the 1950s. Her perspective, that of a young woman who just recently had navigated her way through the same obstacles on the road to the American Dream that teens were facing, was a welcome voice for girls especially. Rather than assessing the advice – or even demands – from “sympathetic,” but masculine, authorities such as Pat Boone and Dick Clark, girls could look to Betty Betz as a feminine authority who had their own interests at heart. She also could understand the conflicting expectations impressed upon girls to be age-appropriate, yet future wives and mothers in training. Betz took her position of authority quite seriously, and published a wide variety of books between 1946 and 1962: *Your Manners Are Showing: The Handbook of Teen-Age Know-How* (1946); *The Betty Betz Party Book: The Teen-Age Guide to Social Success* (1947); *The Betty Betz Career Book: The Teen-Age Guide to a*

Successful Future (1949); *The Betty Betz Teen-Age Cookbook* (1953); and *Manners for Moppets* (1962).

The most fascinating of these books, however, was not so much an advice book as it was an analysis of “what could be” if communism infiltrated American life and culture. *Betty Betz in Teen Asia*, published in 1951, is this young woman’s story of how Asian nations had changed remarkably since her earlier visits as a student, before World War II and the proclamation of the People’s Republic of China in 1949. This cautionary tale revealed the similarities that Betz observed among young people around the world – they like to eat, dance, and gather with their peers – as well as the restrictions and regression she saw in young people who were subjected to Communist rule. Betz also expressed her optimism for global unity (on democratic terms) in passages such as the following:

Perhaps if we Americans had learned to appreciate Asiatic peoples years ago, we would not have a Far Eastern problem today. Just as many of us accuse the yellow man of being untrustworthy, many Asiatics have been brought up to hate the white man, who has a reputation for ruthlessly exploiting Orientals. Prejudices were magnified on both sides during the terrible years of World War II. At that time I frequently found myself involved in heated arguments when I suggested that perhaps the Japanese didn’t want to fight any more than we did. But that was yesterday ... and now we must look ahead. After revisiting Japan, I *know* that the people are grateful to the United States for helping them rebuild their country as well as their morale. Their daily prayers are made in the hope that there will soon be lasting world peace.²⁰

In perhaps the most intriguing section of the book, Betz discussed her conversations with General Douglas MacArthur, serving as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers during the United States’ occupation of Japan.

Leading up to her initial meeting, she noted, “I was relieved that my friends had survived the bombings, and found that instead of feeling bitter toward Americans, they respected us. At times, they seemed happy that we had won the war, for the result of it was their new freedom.”²¹ Continuing on to her description of the General, Betz described MacArthur’s role in Japan:

The Japanese virtually worship General Douglas MacArthur, who did a remarkable job of feeding, clothing and housing them as well as educating them in the ways of democracy ... He looked tall and handsome, and had a dignified manner. His eyes were friendly ... Although he sincerely likes the Japanese, General MacArthur seldom mixed with them socially, which impressed the people of Japan. A back-slapping, good-time American ‘Joe’ brings laughter to serious Japanese faces. The people have more respect for a leader who is dignified and reticent.²²

Betz also reassured her readers that the Japanese were not suffering noticeably since the bombings to end World War II:

How happy, healthy and roly-poly the Japanese school kids looked! ... I soon realized that it’s out-of-door sports and walking miles to school every day that keeps them ‘in the pink.’ Although rice is rationed, poor people are better off than they’ve ever been ... They seem to have fared better than any other kids in Asia, for they’re not only fed and clothed, but well educated, too.²³

Finally, Betz described her day in a Japanese classroom, during which the students requested that she explain to them what democracy *really* means.

They did not want to miss a word spoken by the American lady who actually *lived* in that fabulous land ... As I looked into the shining dark eyes focused on me, I realized that the young Japanese wanted to understand the meaning of democracy, but that it was not to be learned from books. In the United States, we *live* democracy ... I wondered how I could explain our way of life to Japanese students whose only knowledge of us is gained at second hand. If they could only visit for a few weeks with average American families ...²⁴

Whether intentional or not, Betz repeatedly expressed her desire for world peace and all of the world's peoples to live amicably, yet never ceased to categorize Americans as "us" and any part of the Asian populations she visits as "them." Such subtle yet indicative writing highlights the inherent superiority of American values and society that Betz espoused throughout the book.

The great advantages and opportunities available to young Americans were highlighted in Betz's earlier book, *The Betty Betz Career Book: The Teen-Age Guide to a Successful Future*. In this guide to the range of professions available as the United States headed into the 1950s, Betz provided her own suggestions for seeking information and gaining valuable experience that would put teenagers at a distinct advantage when pursuing their career aspirations. Her advice was sound and practical: determine your strengths and interests, assess your skills, find mentors, find part-time time jobs that can provide worthwhile experience, behave maturely, and the like. Betz did not specifically distinguish potential careers along gender lines, though in her introductory section several examples implicitly assign occupations with gendered pronouns; the fashion designer, secretary, and retail staff are described as "she" or "her," while the jobs in drugstores, offices, and banks are assigned to "he" or "him." Despite these differences, the general advice provided pertained to girls and boys alike, indicating that Betz, herself a professional career woman, supported the aspirations of teenage girls who desired a long-term career in any field they felt compelled and dedicated to pursue.

Betz also assembled career advice from notable and highly respected leaders in their respective fields, spanning industry, agriculture, medicine, politics, the arts, and beyond. While many of the women included in the “expert” section worked in fashion, entertainment, the arts, and “pink collar” fields, there are a few exceptions. Jacqueline Cochran, leader of the Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) during World War II, was featured in the Aviation section; Margaret Chase Smith, a Congresswoman and Senator from Maine was included in the Politics section; Fleur Cowles, editor of *Look* magazine, provided advice in the Publishing section; and columnist Dorothy Kilgallen and playwright Anita Loos discussed their careers in the Writing section. These women were established and successful practitioners in their fields, and had worthwhile experiences from which a young person could glean insight. Their advice was detailed, practical, and encouraged young people, with no gender distinctions, to become assertive, inquisitive, and engaged with their chosen field as early as possible. However, one particular statement from Cochran shed light on the status of women in the early Cold War era:

Young men can be relatively assured of a definite career in whatever branch of aviation they may select. Women’s place in aviation will be more secure when the industry grows... However, it would not be economically sound to employ women as airline pilots. Many years are required before one may qualify as a captain and the interest of the majority of women turns to home and children.²⁵

Cochran’s inside view of the aviation industry revealed that, despite her own significant achievements, the likelihood that a girl could follow in her footsteps at

that time was minimal – even if a girl did not desire to be devoted to “home and children,” the industry at large assumed she would.

These types of assumptions and attitudes certainly were prevalent in a great number of businesses and industries during this era, but encouragement from women like Betty Betz indicated that a shift in girls’ attitudes, notably challenges to such stereotypes, was on the horizon. The very fact that Betz published a career book aimed at girls and boys indicated that she believed more possibilities were open to young women, and that they could *choose* a career to fulfill their desires and passions, whether they chose to marry or not. She also believed that American teenagers had a distinct advantage and privilege, by virtue of their birthplace, to exercise those choices and achieve success. As Betz pointed out, “Some of you would like to be millionaires... This is the only country in the world where it’s possible to do it, and if your heart and mind are set on it, it certainly can be done.”²⁶

The crises and challenges expressed by corporate analysts and academics highlighted the importance of structure, guidance, and education for American teenagers, with acknowledgement that such messages would need to be expressed in language that would appeal to youth. One of the first advertising executives to realize the potential of the youth market was Eugene Gilbert, a young entrepreneur who was only a few years out of high school himself when he became a market researcher. Gilbert not only spoke the language of teenagers, he could interpret it for advertisers and marketers. Gilbert began his research in 1945; within two years, he had more than 300 researchers working

for him and moved his Youth Marking Co. to New York City. He held accounts with several national companies, including Quaker Oats, Maybelline, Studebaker, and United Airlines.²⁷ Gilbert's success with major companies coincided with his pronouncement of a distinct teenage target market which spent millions of dollars on snack foods and soft drinks every week. Gilbert also produced monthly newspaper columns entitled "The Boys' Outfitter" and "Girls and Teen Merchandise." Due to Gilbert's research and analysis, spending for radio shows presented for the youth audience increase over tenfold between 1941 and 1951, and major corporations, such as Ford Motor Company, began sponsoring youth-oriented programming.²⁸

By training teenagers as responsible "purchaser citizens" through advertising aimed directly at them, Americans indicated their faith in this generation of youth. Corporate advertisements on radio shows and in broad circulation publications were viable options, but far from the most influential. Among the primary venues for "purchaser citizen" training were the popular teen fashion and music magazines that were created for an audience comprised mostly of teenage girls. The most popular of these magazines in the postwar era were *Seventeen* and *16 Magazine*.

"Don't Forget to Dream a Little"

Most teen fashion and music magazines addressed a specific teenage girl audience and highlighted the obstacles and concerns these girls would face in their newly discovered worlds of adolescence and consumer culture. Teen

magazines such as *Seventeen* and *16 Magazine* also facilitated the creation of a space for readers to share their feelings, concerns, and dreams while encouraging a youth consumer culture and allowing their readers agency in creating this imagined space. While these magazines shared many characteristics, there are significant differences between them as well. Most notably, *Seventeen* was primarily a fashion magazine, whereas *16 Magazine* was primarily a celebrity fan magazine which focused on pop music and television stars. Advertisers supplied the greater percentage of *Seventeen's* revenue. Gloria Stavers, the editor of *16 Magazine*, refused to accept or print advertising from external marketers in her magazine, the revenue of which was generated by subscriptions, newsstand sales, and affiliated publications. The implications of these differences will be considered as part of how these magazines' producers perceived and addressed their readers, teenagers who were a highly desired target consumer market during the postwar era.

Seventeen debuted in September 1944, and quickly had a significant impact on the youth market and in shaping teenage trends. Within five years, its circulation exceeded 2.5 million copies per monthly issue. Due to its "pass-along" factor, *Seventeen's* producers believed it reached at least three million readers every month through copies shared among family and friends. As Kelly Schrum has established, *Seventeen* contended it was the "voice" of an aggregate population of teenage girls and positioned itself as a cultural mediator between American girls and the industry leaders who courted their consumer interest - advertisers, manufacturers, and the mass media - despite the fact that its

audience was mostly white, middle class girls. Realizing the magazine's influence as a cultural mediator, its publishers invested significant time and financial resources to explicate and promote *their* definition of "Teena," the prototypical teenage girl. *Seventeen* appealed to teenage girls because it was created specifically for them and addressed their interests and concerns; it appealed to advertisers because it brought them a consistent audience of teenage consumers. The magazine was highly influential as a mediator between marketers and consumers; *Seventeen* developed a representation of the teenage girl as a consumer of the magazine and the products advertised within its covers, but also as a consequential member of society at large.²⁹

The editors and publishers of *Seventeen* espoused the idea of the "civic consumerism," the belief and practice of merging one's role as an active American citizen with one's duty to be a responsible and active consumer. Just as *Seventeen's* staff negotiated with its advertisers, it also negotiated with readers, acknowledging their interests but ultimately dictating the content of the magazine as the editors saw fit. Editor Helen Valentine and her staff wanted to help girls find their own way through their problems and the complicated world they would enter as adults, and, at the same time, tried to communicate directly with girls and acknowledge them as responsible young women. The theme of civic consumerism could be identified throughout the features in the magazine, which "cultivated insecurity and the constant need for personal improvement, similar to its advertising content ... [but] also recommended books on inflation and atomic energy, offered articles on politics and world affairs, and encouraged

its readers to take responsibility for themselves and become active, questioning citizens.”³⁰

Grace Palladino’s evaluation of *Seventeen* reveals that the magazine’s producers initiated this mediatory relationship after creating an exploratory campaign to assess teenage preferences and buying habits, then presenting advertisers with an audience characterized as viable potential consumers who had a compelling interest in learning consumer behaviors. Advertising agencies soon produced specialized copy for *Seventeen*, recognizing the influence the magazine had within teenage girl culture; according to a *Seventeen* promotional director, “An ad that worked in *Vogue*, for instance, would not suit the wholesome, fresh-faced girls who read *Seventeen*.” The magazine assisted advertisers in adapting their messages for a teenage audience by deciphering the teenagers’ interests and buying habits for advertisers and manufacturers. Meanwhile, the editors carefully influenced those interests and habits along prevalent middle-class lines, which reflected the magazine’s audience – or at least the environments in which they were raised. Helen Valentine supported and defended the teenage desire for personal freedom, but within the context of personal responsibility; her editorial tone was similar to that of an affable and caring, yet concerned, older sister. In each monthly issue, *Seventeen* provided instructive articles on home economics and specifically noted where teenagers could buy the products they needed to address their needs. The magazine also provided tips and regimens for grooming, dieting, and fashion that assuaged teenage concerns, while introducing readers to products and manufacturers who

could “solve their problems.” *Seventeen’s* approach to its audience suited both ideals, as it taught naive consumers key elements of astute buying practices, such as developing a budget, evaluating quality and price, and “how to distinguish the important differences between short-term style and long-term satisfaction.”³¹ *Seventeen’s* producers encouraged their readers to be not only ideal girls but also ideal Americans, best accomplished through the practices of consumerism.

Satisfaction was a prominent theme in another popular teen magazine of the postwar era, *16 Magazine*. However, the satisfaction *16 Magazine* promoted was less focused on consumerism and more focused on cultivating a “Dreamsville” for its readers, a fantasy and planning space in which girls could convene with their idols and imaginatively practice romantic and social behaviors. Given its significant readership, *16 Magazine* was another publication that was highly influential as a mediator between marketers and consumers. However, *16 Magazine* did not accept advertising from outside marketers, which required more subtle forms of consumer cultivation and greater influence from its editor, Gloria Stavers.

In 1958, when the publishers of *16 Magazine* placed their faith in Gloria Stavers, a young clerical assistant with no journalistic background whose previously professional experience was as a model, the publication became a moderate success. Through the early 1960s, Stavers toyed with the formula for the magazine that would become the cornerstone of the teen music publication market. She realized that, rather than a mere fan magazine, her readers were

searching for a “space” in which they could not only read about their favorite stars, but also express their own feelings about these stars and much more. Stavers steered the magazine in a much different direction than its publishers originally intended. The earliest issues resembled other celebrity fan magazines, with information gathered from press releases and photo agencies. After her promotion to editor-in-chief, Stavers refocused the magazine to more directly address the interests and fantasies of its readers. The concept behind Gloria Stavers’s *16 Magazine* was that of a private sphere that brought together femininity, leisure, and consumption while focusing on pop musicians, television stars, and stylish models, all within the parameters of American social and cultural values, including norms of “appropriate” gendered and generational behavior and practices – a “Dreamsville” for her readers. Stavers’s concept largely expanded on a piece of advice Betty Betz wrote a decade earlier: “Don’t forget to dream a little.”³²

NOTES

1. Gloria Stavers, "Who Are You? What Are You?" in *16's Popularity & Beauty Book* (New York: The Girl Friend-Boy Friend Corporation, c. 1964), 3.
2. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988) and Susan M. Hartmann, "Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years" in *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*, ed. Joanne Meyerowitz (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994).
3. Richard Nixon, quoted in May, 12. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see also Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003).
4. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Lynn Peril, *Pink Think: Becoming a Woman in Many Uneasy Lessons* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002) and Kathy Peiss, *Hope in a Jar: The Making of America's Beauty Culture* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998).
5. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Tom Pendergast, *Creating the Modern Man: American Magazines and Consumer Culture, 1900-1950* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000) and Bill Osgerby, *Playboys in Paradise: Masculinity, Youth and Leisure-style in Modern America* (Oxford: Berg, 2001).
6. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Lynn Spigel, *Make Room for TV: Television and the Family Ideal in Postwar America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) and George Lipsitz, *Time Passages: Collective Memory and American Popular Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990).
7. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).
8. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Beth Bailey, "From Panty Raids to Revolution: Youth and Authority, 1950-1970," in *Generations of Youth: Youth Cultures and History in Twentieth-Century America*, eds. Joe Austin and Michael Nevin Willard (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

-
9. Susan J. Douglas, *Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media* (New York: Times Books, 1994), 23.
 10. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Cohen; Douglas; and Grace Palladino, *Teenagers: An American History* (New York: BasicBooks, 1996).
 11. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Whitfield.
 12. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see May; Peril; and Beth Bailey, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).
 13. Vance Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders* (New York: Pocket Books/Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1957; reprint, Brooklyn: Ig Publishing, 2007), 158-160.
 14. New York Times Best Seller List, "Twixt Twelve and Twenty by Pat Boone." <http://nytbestsellerlist.com/book/X7718/TWIXT-TWELVE-AND-TWENTY/Pat-Boone> (accessed July 15, 2011).
 15. Joel Whitburn, *The Billboard Book of Top 40 Hits* (New York: Billboard Books, 1996), 806.
 16. Phillip H. Ennis, *The Seventh Stream: The Emergence of Rocknroll in American Popular Music* (Indianapolis: Wesleyan, 1992), 252.
 17. Dick Clark, *Your Happiest Years* (New York: Rosho House/Random House, Inc., 1959), 5-6.
 18. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Moya Luckett, "Girl Watchers: Patty Duke and Teen TV," in *The Revolution Wasn't Televised: Sixties Television and Social Conflict*, eds. Lynn Spigel and Michael Curtin (New York: Routledge, 1997); and Ilana Nash, *American Sweethearts: Teenage Girls in Twentieth-Century Popular Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).
 19. For theories that influenced these arguments, see Cohen; Palladino; Kelly Schrum, "'Teena Means Business': Teenage Girls' Culture and Seventeen Magazine, 1944-1950," in *Delinquents and Debutantes: Twentieth-Century American Girls' Culture*, ed. Sherrie A. Inness (New York: New York University Press, 1998); and Wini Breines, *Young, White, and Miserable: Growing Up Female in the Fifties* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992).

-
20. Betty Betz, *Betty Betz in Teen Asia* (New York: Random House, 1951), 18-19. Emphasis in original text.
 21. Betz, *Teen Asia*, 24.
 22. Betz, *Teen Asia*, 24-27.
 23. Betz, *Teen Asia*, 27.
 24. Betz, *Teen Asia*, 29-31.
 25. Jacqueline Cochran, in Betty Betz, *The Betty Betz Career Book: The Teen-Age Guide to a Successful Future* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1949), 91.
 26. Betz, *Career Book*, 61-62.
 27. Palladino, 109-110.
 28. Palladino, 110.
 29. Schrum, "Teena," 134-139.
 30. Schrum, "Teena," 149.
 31. Palladino, 102-109.
 32. Betz, *Career Book*, 10.

Gloria Stavers and “*The Magazine for Smart Girls*”:

The Distinctions of *16 Magazine*

1960-1963

“They tell me what to do and who to write about... and I pay attention to their letters. I think I’ve developed a sort of sixth sense about who is going to be popular... But my readers, they know. They can tell when something isn’t right.” – Gloria Stavers¹

Teenagers were identified as a targeted market within American consumer culture in the post-World War II era. In these years of the “baby boom,” youth culture blossomed amidst economic prosperity, which allowed them significant amounts of discretionary spending dollars, and greater high school attendance, which cultivated a peer culture that enhanced teenagers’ separation from their parents’ influence. This adolescent youth culture raised concerns among social critics, who feared that decreased parental authority would lead to generations of delinquents and open the door for subversive ideologies and activities during the Cold War.

Some cultural producers, aware of such concerns, created products that would stave off subversive influences while encouraging consumer practices and defending democratic ideals. The producers of America’s most popular teen magazines in this era supported these practices and their publications fostered the incorporation of responsible consumption within youth culture during this era. Advertisers and editorial staffs of popular magazines reflected and cultivated a unique girls’ culture within the contexts of consumer culture and perceptions of idealized femininity during the 1950s and 1960s. By doing so, these producers

encouraged teenage girls to become not only ideal girls, but ideal consumers as well. The sense of civic duty and the responsibility to uphold American ideals were reflected in the model of the “civic consumer,” notably espoused and represented in the pages of *Seventeen* magazine. However, other magazines tailored this model for their own purposes, including *16 Magazine*.

The historical contexts within which magazine producers attracted their audiences and created content to cultivate consumers are well-documented and evaluated. In *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century*, Richard Ohmann assessed the roles of magazine producers – publishers, advertisers, and editors – in the formation of an American mass culture in the 1890s. Ohmann argued that popular magazines helped their readers, an emerging professional middle class, negotiate the changing realms of work, consumption, and home life as they were affected by the new consumer culture. Ohmann presents numerous examples of how the content of magazines was designed to reduce the distance between the reader and the subject at hand. In essence, magazine producers, through their use of photographs, advertisements, feature articles, and monthly departments, “located the reader socially” in the same types of environments and situations in which the subjects lived.² This created an imaginary community for the readers in which they and the intellectually and culturally elite (as they were presented) had common needs and desires, which could be best be addressed through consumer practices - especially through the consumption of the products advertised within the magazines’ pages.

Ellen Gruber Garvey expanded upon Ohmann's arguments in *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s*. Garvey gave more agency to the consumers and specifically revealed how girls "learned to fantasize within the images of consumption provided, and they used the discourse of advertising to articulate and comment on their own fantasies."³ Garvey explored how producers and consumers together constructed languages and practices of consumption, and noted, "Readers' interaction with advertising has never been a passive process of absorbing advertising messages... these readers were constructed, and constructed themselves, as consumers."⁴

Lizabeth Cohen established the concept of the "purchaser citizen" in *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*, asserting that consumerism served as a way to preserve American ideals and boost civic responsibility amidst the rhetoric and ideology of the Cold War. Cohen argued that in the aftermath of the

wartime conflict between citizen consumers, who reoriented their personal consumption to serve the general good, and purchaser consumers, who pursued private gain regardless of it, emerged a new postwar ideal of the purchaser as citizen who simultaneously fulfilled personal desire and civic obligation by consuming.⁵

Cohen's analysis also provided general information on the specific attraction of marketers to teenagers in the postwar era: "What began as an awareness during and after World War II of a distinctive 'teenage' stage of life, with its own language, customs, and emotional traumas, very quickly developed into a consumer market. Most often credited with pioneering this notion of a teenage

market was a Chicago-born advertising pioneer named Eugene Gilbert.”⁶ The influence of Gilbert was addressed in the previous chapter, noting how his pronouncements regarding the youth market strongly influenced the producers who advertised in *Seventeen* and other media outlets targeting teenagers. Gilbert’s influence on the concept of target marketing throughout American business and industry was demonstrated in 1957, when Standard Oil research analyst Robert O. Carlson stressed the importance for companies to “plan public information campaigns which will utilize media and messages best adapted to the interest of prime target groups in a population.” He cautioned that such targeted messages need to be carefully constructed, and used teenagers as his primary example, noting that “it is perfectly reasonable to talk about teen-agers... provided one does not believe that this concept actually represents a neatly encapsulated group of young people... The fallacy of such thinking leads to the writing of too specialized messages for groups which exist only in the head of the public relations planner.” The result could be “a backlash effect as other groups in the public eavesdrop on messages which they were never intended to receive.”⁷

As a distinct youth culture developed and gained prominence in America, perceptions of teenagers themselves were of great concern, especially insofar as how they could best be encouraged to be ideal Americans, conforming to the values of democracy and capitalism. The idea of a “moral panic” regarding American teenagers was prominent in popular and academic discussions in the postwar era, especially as the independent and rebellious nature of adolescents

was promoted in the media. The belief that young people were becoming more aggressive and defiant was attributed to numerous factors: lack of parental supervision, increased autonomy and peer socialization, emasculated fathers returning from war, and defeminized mothers who filled men's roles during the war were a few posited causes. As James Gilbert described, concerned authorities leveled accusations that American culture had damaged adolescents by stealing their innocence, independence, and the essence of childhood by bombarding them with images of sex, crime, and general bad behavior, instigating replication of such behavior among American youth and creating the "juvenile delinquent."⁸ Ilana Nash detailed how cultural concerns focused more specifically on the behavior of women and youth, due to their central roles in creating and cultivating future citizens. Anxious critics indicated that America's future was at risk not only from external threats, but also from internal challenges to an established gender and generational structure; as girls' fashions and behavior became "less feminine," they argued, the domestic foundation of American society was at risk.⁹

Contemplating pervasive fears of subversion and immorality potentially affecting American teenagers, one of the dominant modes of thought among intellectuals was to encourage conformity and structure through consumerism. A 1963 research study entitled "The Adolescent as a Consumer: Facts and Implications" cited the "growing concern [that] has been expressed regarding the need for investigation of the importance of adolescents as consumers and the implications of such behavior for education," in light of the revelation that "the

17.2 million American teen-agers... have more than *nine billion dollars* to spend each year.”¹⁰ The study determined that because “teen-agers have money... and have freedom in its use... the need for education in money management” was essential for American youth. “Such education should include not only how to buy and other phases of consumer education, but also the development of a recognition of the responsibility that one has when he has money.”¹¹ The influence of adults was imperative in this development. Teachers and parents “have a serious purpose in using money as a training instrument” and “need to help youth become aware of items other than only those promoted by advertising campaigns.”¹² Among the suggested approaches were “Indicat[ing] that experiences in decision making and use of money are relevant for children regardless of their future occupational choices” and “Explain[ing] the necessity of enabling children to develop new values more suitable for the age in which they live.”¹³ The study also revealed the “necessity for youth as consumers to be educated in the psychological as well as the socioeconomic aspects of [commodities]”¹⁴ with “recognition made of differences between the sexes in money management interests and habits.”¹⁵ The study’s results led to the proclamation that America’s youth must be taught “*Responsibility* – a concern for being a responsible consumer.”¹⁶

Contrasting the Teen Magazines of the 1960s

Teen fashion and music magazines addressed a specific teenage girl audience and highlighted the obstacles and concerns these girls would face in

their newly discovered worlds of adolescence and consumer culture. Teen magazines such as *Seventeen* and *16 Magazine* also facilitated the creation of a space for readers to share their feelings, concerns, and dreams while encouraging a youth consumer culture and allowing their readers agency in creating this imagined space. While these magazines shared many characteristics, there are significant differences between them as well. Most notably, *Seventeen* was primarily a fashion magazine, whereas *16 Magazine* was primarily a celebrity fan magazine that focused on pop music and television stars. The majority of *Seventeen's* revenue was supplied by advertisers; Gloria Stavers, the editor of *16 Magazine*, refused to accept or print advertising from external marketers in her magazine, the revenue of which was generated by subscriptions, newsstand sales, and affiliated publications.

The implications of these differences will be considered as part of how these magazines' producers perceived and addressed their readers, teenagers who were a relatively new, yet highly desired target consumer market at mid-century. In addition, this analysis will address the format and themes of other popular teen magazines from the Cold War era: *Dig*, *Teen*, *Flip*, and *Tiger Beat*. Ultimately, it will reveal how *16 Magazine* functioned differently within girl culture – and why *16 Magazine* resonated with girls during their formative years in ways that the others did not.

16 Magazine was conceived initially by Jacques Chambrun, Desmond Hall, and George Waller, middle-aged men who saw a lucrative opportunity for a music magazine aimed at a teenage audience in response to the rock 'n' roll

craze led by Elvis Presley.¹⁷ *16 Magazine* debuted in May 1957 with Elvis Presley on its cover, with subsequent issues that year featuring Harry Belafonte, Pat Boone, Johnny Mathis, Ricky Nelson, Jimmy Rodgers, and Paul Anka. In its earliest issues, *16 Magazine* was subtitled “The Magazine for SMART Girls,” with, according to its publishers, “its only product [being] fantasy.”¹⁸ In its first years, *16 Magazine* was published every other month; it became a monthly publication in 1959, after Gloria Stavers (under the pseudonym “Georgia Winters”) became editor-in-chief and began the process of fine-tuning the features and content to better address readers’ demands. Though *16 Magazine* began publication in response to the popularity of Presley and rock ‘n’ roll in general, other celebrity magazines targeting teen audiences saw their origins earlier. The most notable of these was *DIG*, published by Teenage Publications, Inc., in Hollywood, California, and conceived by Lou Kimzey, the magazine’s editor and publisher.¹⁹ The first issue of *DIG* is dated December 1955, and hit newsstands months before the release of Presley’s first number one single, “Heartbreak Hotel.” Through its duration, *DIG* featured various subtitles, including “The Voice of the Teenage Youth,” “The Original Teen Magazine,” and “For Teenagers Only!”

The tone of *DIG* was more irreverent than other teen magazines. Rather than trying to emulate the style of mass magazines for adults, *DIG* purposely addressed young people in their own vernacular with articles that pointed out the uniqueness of the Baby Boomer generation. *DIG* aimed its features at boys and girls; some were designated specifically for one gender, while others took a

generational tone and perspective. Among the regular features for boys were “Bull Session,” “the first feature ever presented in any magazine which covers fashions and clothes styles for teenage men,”²⁰ and “The FLANG Report,” which specifically stated “NO GIRLS ALLOWED.”²¹ Features for girls included “The Hen House,” which was “for chicks only,”²² and a monthly beauty advice column from William Adrian, the founder of a teen modeling agency. “Adrian Answers Your Questions!!” additionally was designated as “Girlsonlyville!”²³

Though *DIG* incorporated gender-specific features, the majority of the magazine focused on generational commonalities, trends, and issues. Regular features included “Letters to the Janitor,” “Recordville,” “Fadsville,” “Uncensored Teenage Opinions” comprised of letters from readers, “Diggin’ *DIG*” penned by “Mother Trask,” and pictorials of surfing, hot rods, and youth fashions.

Occasional features included “Prettiest Teacher,” “Greek God,” and “Paper Mates” (pen pal requests), all notable for their diversity in age, ethnic, and racial compositions. However, two regular features deserve closer attention:

“Problems,” an advice column written first by Lilly Cooper, then by Patricia Paul; and “Cloud Nine,” a monthly contest in which *DIG* would select reader requests to grant personal wishes.

“Problems” looked like a typical advice piece but included issues rarely discussed in most teen magazines. Each month’s column included an introductory paragraph: “Talking about your problems is the first step toward solving them. This column is devoted to your problem or one just like yours. Our purpose is to help you think, decide and act for yourself...”²⁴ This invitation to

share concerns clearly shows the influence of adolescent psychology that permeated the era, but the autonomy that is encouraged for the reader to “think, decide and act for yourself” bolsters the maturity level that was often regarded as missing from teenagers. Perhaps this is due to the subject matter of the “problems” themselves. A letter in the January 1958 issue from “Airman” begins, “There is this girl I love very much. When I enlisted in the Air Force, while I was in basic training, I received a ‘Dear John’ letter from her.” “Airman” continues with his suspicion that the girl’s parents have forbidden her from contacting him, then comes to his point: “She is 16, I am 18. I believe I can make her a good husband and provider. Please help me if you know of any way.” Another question, from “Confused” in the same issue, addresses “petting” among teens:

I’m 16 and my boy friend is 17... Bill and I really love each other and plan to be married some day. We have talked a lot about sex but lately it has become a problem since Bill wants to pet every time we go out. In our school a lot of kids are suddenly going all the way. We have been double-dating with this real swell couple and today I found out that they have been going all the way for two months... Please please help me decide what to do.²⁵

The September 1958 “Problems” column includes two letters involving serious issues that would rarely be discussed publicly. The first, from “Lonesome”: “I am a girl of eighteen and single. I have never been married. I am very lonely... I have a baby girl nine months old. I want to go to church and straighten out my life, but I just don’t seem to have it in me to get up and go. I have no one who cares anything about me... Please give me advice.” The second, from “Nita,” revolves around a different, but similarly polarizing issue:

At school I’ve been getting a bad reputation, not because I’ve done anything wrong, but because I make friends only with Mexicans. I

find them, as a whole, more kind and considerate than other kids, and I have found that when you have a Chicano for a friend, you have a friend for life. I am a Catholic as they are and I speak Spanish like a native and know their customs and dances. As far as I'm concerned, a white and a Mexican are as much alike as an Englishman and a Frenchman. If God hadn't intended inter-marriage why didn't He make it impossible? They say my children would be 'half-breeds.' So what? Isn't everybody part one thing and part another? Please help make them understand!²⁶

The responses to all of these letters carried a similar tone, one of reserved sympathy with practical suggestions. To "Airman," Miss Cooper replied, "... it takes two to make a romance and sometimes you are real lucky to escape marrying someone who doesn't really love you. There's just no answer to your heartache except time but that always heals it." Miss Cooper advised "Confused" in a stricter manner:

Petting is actually the love-making that precedes the marriage relationship and can easily reach a point of no return. So the couple who really love each other will avoid situations where they get too involved to be able to stop in time. If Bill is truly concerned about you, he will recognize that the risks of 'going all the way' are borne most heavily by the girl and he will respect your attitude. There are so many pleasant, subtle ways that boys and girls can use to express affection for each other that it is plain foolish to step out of bounds. So a wise girl will accept her responsibility of keeping the relationship on an even keel, and a mature boy will understand and help her and like her the better for it.²⁷

"Lonesome" received stern sympathy: "You do have someone who cares about you – your little girl. The love of a child is the greatest love you will ever experience, until you meet a man who will respect you and marry you. Eighty thousand teenage girls a year make the same mistake you have, so you are not alone... You can only conquer loneliness by doing something about it. Don't sit and brood... Join a young peoples' church group – any sect is fine. They have

many functions where you will meet nice boys and girls your own age and build up your social contacts once more.” Miss Cooper did not deprecate “Nita,” but did chide her: “There are nice people in all nationalities and all races, Nita, so why limit your friendship only to those of Mexican origin? Why not make friends with nice ‘norteamericanos’ too, naturally among the unprejudiced kind because prejudiced people are usually not as nice as unprejudiced people. Then you’ll get to know all kinds of people and have a better time because of it.”²⁸

Another regular feature that drew much attention – noted as “the most popular feature *DIG* has ever published” – was “Dig’s Cloud 9,” a feature in which readers would send their “fondest dreams” to *DIG*’s office and editors would select certain “dreams” to bring true for lucky readers. The introduction to “Dig’s Cloud 9” announced “*DIG* WILL MAKE YOUR DREAMS COME TRUE!” and invited the reader to submit a “special dream, no matter how crazy it may be” provided they followed three requirements: “First, you must be a teenager. Second, your dream must be possible to fulfill. (We can’t send you to the moon... yet!) Third, you must send a photo of yourself.”²⁹ The pages that followed this introduction each month provided photos and descriptions of the dreams that were fulfilled – and they covered a wide array of teen dreams. January 1960’s layout included a pet kitten for Rolland Lindgren’s girlfriend, a trip back to his hometown for John Bernard, a meeting with Rick Nelson for Pam Beck, a special anniversary gift for Bev Hetherington’s parents, and skindiving lessons for Richard Wolf.³⁰

However, the “dreams” became more substantial and emotional as the feature continued. In one of the most surprising reveals, Marcia Dickenson from Plymouth, New Hampshire, was reunited with her father after a 14-year absence.

From all over the country, *DIG* readers sent in information trying to help. Finally, the miracle happened: Marcia’s dream came true! Her father was located! After a wait of 14 years, Marcia was finally able to talk to her dad on the phone, and now, this summer, she’s going to visit him and get to know him all over again. *DIG* is proud to have been a part of something as wonderful as this. And we’re proud of the hundreds of teenagers who made it all possible, the readers who helped Marcia find her dad! It’s not possible to give thanks to *all* those who helped in this great search, but we would like to name the people who first made Marcia’s dream come true. As fate would have it, they all live in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where Marcia’s Dad is now located.³¹

After Marcia’s fulfilled dream, the others in the August 1960 issue – a trip to America for West German Gerd Brandt and his jazz band, a pink telephone and her own private line for Sandy Barbendure, dental work for Teresa Chavez – seemed somewhat mundane. However, another request for a “missing father,” that of Patty Jo Traina, was printed and *DIG*’s editors appealed to the readers again: “Patty Jo’s dream could very well depend on YOU, so won’t you please do what you can to help us make it come true? If you have any information at all which could help Patty Jo find her dad, write to DIG’S LOST DAD...”³²

September 1960’s “Dig’s Cloud 9” featured yet another request for a reunion, though Phillip Grant had only been separated from his father for three years; in addition, *DIG* granted the wishes of a pocket radio for Maria Han, a portable phonograph for Lyla Lindsey, and surf lessons for Carolyn Cox – who also appeared in a pictorial and on the issue’s cover with her instructor, Robin Luke.³³

DIG did not shy away from potentially controversial issues, nor did it exploit them. Instead, any issues regarding racial, ethnic, and gender inequalities were incorporated into the monthly features. In January 1960's "Paper Mates" pen pal feature, Homer Render from Birmingham, Alabama, writes, "I'm 18, 5'10" and very lonesome. I wouldn't stay lonesome if some girls 16-17 would hurry up and write me!" This is a typical entry, complete with a photo of Homer smiling – and no attention is brought to his living in the South as an African-American.³⁴ The August 1961 "Uncensored Teenage Opinions" features a letter from Judy Willingham of Bessemer, Alabama, responding to a previous month's letter: "The letter didn't make me mad, just disappointed. This girl lives in the South and she should be able to see for herself what the Southern people are having to put up with. We were brought up around Negroes and we don't hate them. We just want them in their place. I'll bet if anyone took the time to come to my city (or any city in the deep South) they would find that more than ninety percent of the Negro population doesn't want to go to school with us any more than we want to go to school with them."³⁵

January 1960's "Uncensored Teenage Opinions" included this submission from a reader in California: "I would like to know why the Jewish and Italian people in show business call themselves Martin, Fisher, Johnson, etc. Is it because they are ashamed of their nationality, or because they're afraid they won't make the grade if they don't sell themselves as Irishmen? It seems to me it's both."³⁶ An article with the innocuous title "Interesting Careers" provided "vocational guidance... [and] facts regarding the requirements that are necessary

in order for you to enter particular professions, occupations, and skilled jobs when you are out of school and planning your future.” What is brazenly obvious, however, is that all of the pictures and descriptions feature women with professional careers.³⁷ With no fanfare, readers from Indonesia, Lebanon, and other countries had their letters published next to those from American readers. *DIG*, as the self-proclaimed “Voice of Teenage Youth,” provided a forum for teens to express themselves and learn about others in their generation – whether they lived within similar circumstances or not.

‘*Teen* published its first issue, featuring James Dean and hot rods on the cover, in June 1957, the same year as *16 Magazine*’s debut.³⁸ Published by ‘TEEN Publications, Inc., in Hollywood, ‘*Teen* featured a predominantly male editorial and business staff, with only one associate editor and the fashion editor being women.³⁹ ‘*Teen* was published in print form until 2009, and presently continues in an online format. Initially subtitled “The Magazine for Young Americans,” by May 1963 ‘*Teen* was calling itself “Young America’s Beauty, Fashion & Entertainment Magazine.”⁴⁰ Analysis of ‘*Teen*’s format and content changes in this timeframe provides informative context against which *16 Magazine* can be compared and contrasted.

In its earliest issues, ‘*Teen* featured music, film, and television stars popular with teenagers on its covers. James Dean, Elvis Presley, Sandra Dee, Sal Mineo, Annette Funicello, and Frankie Avalon were featured in the magazine’s first two years of publication. In 1959, ‘*Teen* featured its first cover with an *American Bandstand* dancer, Pat Molittieri; *American Bandstand* dancers

and its host, Dick Clark, would be featured numerous times on the cover of *Teen* through 1961. However, a pattern emerged in mid-1961 that continued through the 1960s: celebrities were featured less frequently, and teenage models became more common cover subjects. The first such issue, in July 1961, features two young blonde women, one flaunting her “promise ring” while the other looks on in joyous envy. The March 1962 issue features two models, one brunette and one blonde, with the headline, “Are Texas Teens THE MOST BEAUTIFUL?” Further indicating the new direction of *Teen*’s focus is the May 1962 issue, with a young blonde woman wearing a bouffant and an off-the-shoulder peasant blouse, and the headline, “I’M 14... AND I WANT TO BE A MODEL!”

The content of *Teen* changed in parallel fashion to its cover subjects. While celebrity features and fashion advice were always prominent in the magazine, the focus shifted to beauty and fashion, with entertainment a distant third, as the magazine’s masthead promoted in 1963. A sampling of issues from the late 1950s through 1961 show monthly fashion features, related to seasonal trends; fiction features, usually short stories written by women; “Dear Jill,” an advice column; “Wish You Were Here,” a collection of readers seeking pen pals; entertainment columns promoting new releases in music and film; and “We Get,” comprised of letters featuring “comment and controversy from readers.”⁴¹ A significant number of celebrity features also were included each month, as well as pictorials and opinion pieces on teen trends and fads. Advertisements in these early issues were for products that incorporated male and female demographics:

record labels, stereo equipment, and acne treatment products are the most prominently placed products, while female-skewing advertisements for tampons and cosmetics are smaller and less conspicuous.

After *Teen*'s shift to "Young America's Beauty, Fashion & Entertainment Magazine," the magazine's content and advertising lean toward a much more specifically female demographic. July 1964's cover, featuring Donna Loren, claims "GIRLS TAKE OVER," while also promoting "How to Have a Summer Romance" and "1964 Junior Miss Pageant." The advertising included within denotes a clear shift to a predominantly female target audience; full-page color advertisements for Kotex, Cover Girl, Tanfastic Dark-Tanning Oil, and Coppertone stand out with pin-up style photography, while the record labels and stereo equipment are nowhere to be found. Though many of the same monthly features still were included, newer monthly features with feminine perspectives received at least as much column space. "Dear Beauty Editor," "Pretty Talk," "Kathy's Corner" ("A girls-eye-view of the show biz scene!") "Fashion Fun With Sewing," and "Party Line" (female readers submitting trends and fads from their hometowns) were among the new features.

While no specific rationale is announced in its pages, *Teen* clearly moved in a more girl-oriented direction – with more "beauty and fashion"-centered content – by 1964. As more teen magazines began publication in the early to mid-1960s, they mostly revolved around music and television celebrities favored by teen audiences. In addition, it is crucial to note that by 1964, *Teen*'s editorial staff had changed dramatically. Charles Laufner was Editor, as he had been

since the magazine's inception; however, most of the editorial staff were women by 1964. In 1959, *Teen*'s editorial staff included a Fashion Editor and Feature Consultant, as well as assistant editors and art staff; in 1964, the magazine's editorial staff consisted of a Fashion Editor, Beauty Editor, Fashion Associate, Fashion Coordinator, Editorial Consultant, and art staff.⁴² This very telling shift in editorial personnel indicates that *Teen* cogently and thoroughly shifted to more focused attention on beauty and fashion – and, as a result, to a more homogenized female audience.

The Distinctions of *16 Magazine*

In its first years, *16 Magazine* was published every two months; publication shifted to monthly issues in January 1960. From 1957 to 1963, circulation averaged approximately 275,000 per monthly issue. The cover price was 25 cents, and remained so until 1970, making it affordable for girls – roughly the same price as a 45rpm record. In the mid-1960s, simultaneous with the popularity of The Beatles and The Monkees, *16 Magazine* averaged sales of over 1 million copies per issue, including newsstand and subscription sales. In 1969, after the heady pop crazes of the 1960s turned to more serious “counterculture” artist features, circulation remained around 850,000.⁴³ However, many more readers were exposed to *16 Magazine* every month, given the “pass-along readership” factor. By 1967, the magazine boldly asserted on its masthead, “*16* Is the Top Favorite of over Seven Million Readers.”⁴⁴

As early as 1964, *16 Magazine* claimed on its masthead that it was “America’s Most Imitated Magazine!”⁴⁵ The circulation of *16 Magazine* continued to rise despite heavy competition from imitations such as *Tiger Beat*, *Fave*, *Teen Pin-Ups*, *Flip*, *Outasite*, and *Teen World*. In 1969, *Rolling Stone* reported that “*16* has a circulation five times as great as any of its competitors – *Tiger Beat*, *Flip*, *Teen Screen*, *Fave* and others.”⁴⁶ One reason for this was that, according to Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields, “*16* had simply been doing it longer, better, and more thoroughly than any latecomers to the game.”⁴⁷ However, more significant factors were at work in the editorial offices. *16 Magazine* was the only teen magazine that refused outside advertising, and it was the only teen magazine with a female editor-in-chief. These factors cannot be ignored and, in fact, indicate that some girls felt more comfortable in the space created for them by Gloria Stavers. Journalists John Burks and Jerry Hopkins summed up audience trust thusly: “By carefully researching each story and by not ‘faking’ anything, *16* has built an enviable reputation as a magazine its readers *trust*. At the height of the Monkees rage, while most of the competition manufactured phony story after phony story, Gloria flew to Los Angeles several times for personal interviews. And the girls could tell. ‘A typical *16 letter*,’ she states, ‘is one which says: “I know that I can believe what you say about ____.”’⁴⁸ They were able to dream and fantasize about their “fave raves” without intrusion from corporate outsiders, and they were encouraged to do so with content directed and created by a woman who had been there and understood. According to *16 Magazine* associate editors Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields, “No matter what,

and above everything else, Gloria cared about her readers. It went beyond their financial support of the magazine; it went beyond even her own identification with them. Throughout her tenure as editor, she continued to read their letters – every last one that came in... Of course, she was laughed at in the (male-dominated) legitimate press, even called “the Mother Superior of the Inferior,” by people who ridiculed girls and women and what was meaningful to them. But Gloria knew the truth.”⁴⁹

Stavers steered the magazine in a much different direction than its publishers originally had intended. The earliest issues resembled other celebrity fan magazines, with information gathered from press releases and previously published materials; photos were usually supplied at minimal cost from press agents and photo agencies.⁵⁰ Stavers began as a clerical staffer at *16 Magazine*, and paid close attention to the reader contributions that filled the mailroom, especially the letters from fans. “The readers cared about the things they could relate to: how old was the performer, did he have a girlfriend, what did he eat for breakfast, what was his favorite TV show, what music did he listen to.” After her promotion to editor-in-chief, Stavers refocused the magazine to more directly address the interests and fantasies of its readers.

Gloria never printed anything negative about a performer; if the performer him- or herself ever confessed something – or negative news came out that could not be ignored – Gloria put a positive spin on it, eliciting sympathy from the readers... She understood implicitly that the readers would never be angry at their “fave,” they’d be angry at the magazine. She was also careful to present the performer without grown-up vices. “Except for the Beatles, I never printed a picture of someone with a cigarette or a drink,” Gloria once declared.⁵¹

From 1960 to 1963, the magazine “had no editorial staff other than Gloria... [This] is why most of the artists [from this era] talk about her and the magazine as if they were one entity. They were.”⁵² As circulation significantly multiplied during the mid-1960s, Stavers added staff, yet continued to dominate the direction of the magazine and the content included within its pages, based on reader interest. “To be introduced in *16*, a performer did need Gloria’s stamp of approval; to stay in *16*, readers had to respond via their letters, postcards, phone calls. Coverage ended as one’s popularity waned.”⁵³

In 1958, when the publishers of *16 Magazine* placed their faith in a young clerical assistant, a former model with no journalistic background named Gloria Stavers, the publication became a moderate success.⁵⁴ Through the early 1960s, Stavers toyed with the formula for the magazine that would become the cornerstone of the teen music publication market. She realized that, rather than a mere fan magazine, her readers were searching for a “space” in which they could not only read about their favorite stars, but also express their own feelings about these stars and much more. After her promotion to editor-in-chief, Stavers refocused the magazine to more directly address the interests and fantasies of its readers. The concept behind Gloria Stavers’ *16 Magazine* was that of a private sphere that brought together femininity, leisure, and consumption, while focusing on style, fashion, and pop music.

Beyond Stavers’s formal role as editor-in-chief, she was featured in several regular columns in the magazine, each as a different persona. In “You’re Telling Me!” Stavers answered letters from readers, always respectfully and

deferentially addressed to “Miss Stavers,” regarding questions and concerns they had about their favorite stars. Each month’s “You’re Telling Me!” began with a formal announcement:

FROM GLORIA STAVERS

I want to assure each and every one of you who has ever written a letter to me, or to *16 Magazine*, that every single letter is read and that careful consideration is given to everything you write. I’m sure you understand that there isn’t enough space in my magazine for me to publish every letter and that there simply isn’t enough time for me to answer every letter personally. But please know that I’m deeply grateful to you for writing me and that I appreciate every suggestion and criticism you address to me.⁵⁵

Clearly, Stavers wanted to foster an imagined relationship with each reader individually, and addressed her audience in a warm, yet professional manner. Her gracious approach to her readers highlighted her respect and appreciation for them, and encouraged them to contact her with their concerns.

Stavers’s other personas included GeeGee, featured in “GeeGee’s Gossip,” a collection of brief informational items about popular stars and a list of recommended records released that month, and La Gatita, who presented a gossip column with more “catty” items about celebrities. Blind items featured in La Gatita’s column often were considered warnings to stars to cease their bad behavior or questionable activities. Stavers was the featured byline author of intimate stories about stars, such as “Cher’s Brush with Death!”; “The Truth about Those Nasty Monkees Rumors!”; “Sally Field’s Secret Fear!”; and “Sonny & Cher: The Heartbreak Behind Their Laughter.” “Last Minute Flashes!” also featured Gloria Stavers’s by-line and included the “latest” news about new records, films, and tours of popular stars. Stavers took many of the photos

featured in *16 Magazine* herself; some of her photographs are among the most recognizable images of many prominent pop stars of the era.

Simon Frith discounted the value of teen music magazines as promotional fluff, but his arguments identified a crucial element of *16 Magazine*'s strategy during the 1960s. He argued that "Female music, teeny-bop, is... a confidential, private discourse," and that "female consumers are addressed... as individuals, the potential objects of the performer's private needs."⁵⁶ However, Frith generalized beyond teeny-bopper culture to teenage girl culture in general:

Girl culture, indeed, starts and finishes in the bedroom... The work of dressing and making-up, staging the feminine show, is girl culture's central secret... Music is also a way of managing the sexual and emotional tensions implicit in a girl's role: it both expresses them and offers a release. Music and musical idols provide a focus for female fantasies...⁵⁷

Frith was very critical of teen music magazines and, by so quickly dismissing them, overlooked the essence of Gloria Stavers' motivation behind *16 Magazine*. Although Frith acknowledged that *16 Magazine* was the most influential teen music magazine in America, he did not make the connection between the private "space" that the magazine provided to girls and the "emotional tensions" they faced as teenage girls.⁵⁸ While he identified the bedroom space as central to girl culture, where they use their consumer products to signify themselves as members of girl culture, he ignored the role *16 Magazine* played in cultivating that culture, as well as providing the "release" and "focus for female fantasies."

Angela McRobbie argued that teen magazines' primary goal is to cultivate "romantic individualism" in girls, with no acknowledgement of "female

solidarity.”⁵⁹ However, while *16 Magazine* encouraged romantic individualism, especially because many pop stars claimed to like girls “who don’t follow the crowd,” the magazine also incorporated considerable rhetoric of female solidarity. Female stars were utilized as figures to be respected and emulated, while they provided examples of how they too dealt with the concerns, angst, and frustrations of being girls – just like the readers. The “secret sisters” who provided advice in the magazine encouraged strong female relationships and camaraderie. Their names and likenesses lent credibility as models for “ideal girls” and, if anything, encouraged conformity rather than individualism. Their advice columns revealed the keys to gaining popularity, dealing with parents, and expressing interest in a boy, and their advice was consistent: be nice, polite, and respect your parents. If those bits of advice were not enough, *16* offered numerous publications that could assist a girl in her attempts to become an “ideal girl,” including the perpetually promoted “*16*’s Popularity & Beauty Book.” Readers learned from female fashion icons, such as Shelley Fabares and Cher, what signifiers would be useful in attracting “the right boys.” Later, after the magazine and teenage culture were overwhelmingly influenced by British trends, features on how to look like a Beatle’s girlfriend were interspersed with advice columns from popular British models, such as Pattie Boyd, Jill Stuart, Samantha Juste, and Twiggy, on how to adapt their own style to an “appropriate” style for teenage girls.

Perhaps the most unique aspect of Gloria Stavers’s and *16 Magazine*’s influence on girls’ consumer culture was that the magazine did not publish

outside advertising. The magazine's profits were generated solely from its newsstand sales, subscriptions, and affiliated publications. As Gloria Stavers cultivated new generations of consumers, she did so without the influence of any outside companies with vested interests in selling their products, aside from the obvious influence of music promoters – but even their clients would not be included in *16 Magazine* unless Stavers deemed them appropriate for the readers. Gloria Stavers influenced girls' consumer behavior primarily through the editorial content of *16 Magazine*. The considerable monthly circulation indicates that girls were very receptive to the space created for them by Stavers. They were able to dream and fantasize about their “fave raves” without intrusion from corporate outsiders, and they were encouraged to do so with content directed and created by a woman who had been there and understood their concerns, as Helen Valentine did with *Seventeen*. Stavers once stated, “Girls from 10 to 15 are in a period of development more intense than any other period in their lives... By the time a girl actually reaches 16, she's ready to leave the dreamworld; and *16* is way behind her.”⁶⁰

The format of *16 Magazine* remained fairly consistent during its publication. Each monthly issue ran approximately 66 pages, and featured glossy color covers with pin-ups on each of the inside covers. The covers featured cartoonish situations in which the faces of popular stars featured in that issue would be placed on figures in comical positions. These scenarios were fanciful and light-hearted, depicting a fantasy in which the popular stars were interacting. The pin-ups on the inside covers generally were promotional shots of

popular musicians and actors. By 1965, casual shots of stars also were included as pin-ups, offering readers an insider's perspective on the stars.⁶¹

A typical issue featured a variety of male stars from television, film, and popular music, most of whom were not much older than the readers. In its earliest issues, *16 Magazine's* feature articles primarily focused on male stars. No female stars appeared on the cover of *16 Magazine* until January 1959, when Diane Varsi, star of the film *Peyton Place*, was included. The first "girl star" featured regularly in *16 Magazine* actually was not a star in her own right – she was Elvis Presley's girlfriend. Barbara Hearn authored a monthly advice column called "Barbara's Corner" beginning in May 1959, after a few previous features indicated her popularity among readers. Following this template, female stars such as Connie Francis and Lesley Gore were featured as "secret sisters" in the early 1960s, penning advice columns that revealed the keys to gaining popularity, dealing with parents, and expressing interest in a boy. While *16 Magazine's* earliest issues focused predominantly on male stars, a distinct shift occurred after Gloria Stavers began directing the content and design of the publication. In July 1959, Annette Funicello was included in a "*16 Exclusive!*" cover story, and by January 1960, female stars were featured prominently on the cover and in editorial content each month. "It's Tough To Be A Girl" by Connie Francis (January 1960); "Annette Answers 40 Intimate Questions And Spills The Beans" (July 1960); "Tuesday Weld: Do You Have To Be Bad To Be A Star?" (October 1960); and "Shelley Fabares: Is It A Crime To Have A Good Time?"

(October 1961) were among the earliest feature articles focused on female celebrities.

Amongst the most popular and consistently featured stars in *16 Magazine* during its early years were Pat, Arlene, Mike, Carmen, Kenny, and Bob & Justine, among numerous others, who collectively were known as the “Bandstand Dancers.” These Philadelphia teenagers, easily recognizable by just their first names among young viewers, were regular participants on *American Bandstand*, which aired nationally every weekday afternoon on ABC. *American Bandstand* originated from Philadelphia and was broadcast in an after-school timeslot from 1957 to 1964, before relocating to Los Angeles and a weekly Saturday airing. Produced and hosted by Dick Clark, *American Bandstand* featured a rotation of popular Top 40 songs accompanied by a cast of teenage dancers. Clark functioned as the de facto chaperone of show, monitoring the dance floor from an elevated podium as well as dictating the behaviors and appearances of the dancers behind the scenes. Intended to serve as models of normative teenage behavior in alignment with social conventions, the dancers were required to dress conservatively, maintain good grades in school, and show appropriate deference to the elders on the set. The constraining influence of Clark extended to the music on the show as well. The records played never wavered from socially acceptable pop music, and most artists who appeared on the show were required to lip-synch during their performances while the dancers politely clapped and sang along while seated on bleachers to enforce the separation between them and the performers.

American Bandstand positioned teenagers in alignment with mainstream culture – their idiosyncratic styles and tastes did not contradict their respect for authority, conventional dress, and proper behavior. The show drew large audiences, comprised not only of young people but of housewives as well. Their daily observations simultaneously assured parents that young people were not pawns of subversive subcultural influences from listening to popular music and actively participating in their peer culture, while young viewers gained accessibility to signifiers of youth culture, including new dances, fashion trends, and performing artists. The featured dancers who garnered the most airtime became popular stars who received much attention from other media outlets as well, especially teen magazines.

Dick Clark acknowledged a close business relationship with Gloria Stavers, noting their similarities and how their efforts benefited each other's work:

[Gloria] had her finger on the pulse of what kids were thinking about, which impressed me. We both, as adults, could "think young"... We would trade notes about performers and we were very giving to one another. Whatever we found out, we shared. It was good for our business... Gloria helped *American Bandstand*, and the show helped *16*. It was a two-way street.... one augmented the other. The show grew, and so did the magazine."⁶²

16 Magazine utilized the Bandstand Dancers as characters in an ongoing narrative that crossed between the television show and the print publication for several years. In order to absorb all of the narrative and details of the friendships and romances between the dancers, a fan would need to be watching daily and reading the behind-the-scenes gossip. Of course, a more casual observer could enjoy the television show on its own or read articles about the dancers with

interest – but a true, devoted fan would know all of the details and nuances about the boy-girl relationships surrounding *American Bandstand*. Girl dancers were featured in fashion and advice columns, and they gave details of their dates and friendships with male dancers. Boy dancers gave more of the details of the show itself, in “behind the scenes” features that usually focused on other dancers and Dick Clark, rather than any performers. Arlene Sullivan, Kenny Rossi, and Mike Balara were the dancers most frequently credited as authors of numerous articles in *16 Magazine* from 1960 to 1963, but other regular dancers were featured as well. *16 Magazine*’s monthly feature “Bandstand Beat” ran through the April 1964 issue, after which *American Bandstand* relocated to Los Angeles and its new Saturday timeslot – and The Beatles and their British Invasion compatriots dominated the pages of the magazine.

The Bandstand Dancers were not the only Philadelphia teenagers featured in *16 Magazine* during the early 1960s. Closely coinciding with the popularity of *American Bandstand* and the influence of Dick Clark, a bevy of teen idols discovered on street corners and stages in Philadelphia became national stars of radio and television. Bobby Rydell, Frankie Avalon, Fabian enjoyed major Top 40 chart success as pop crooners who delved into acting, young imitations of the models established years earlier by Frank Sinatra and Elvis Presley. After much local success in Philadelphia, their appearances on *American Bandstand* introduced them to a national audience and garnered them legions of loyal fans, many of whom were looking for their *own* young idols, not their older sisters’ Elvis and Dion. In turn, Gloria Stavers was attuned to her

young readers' wishes, and *16 Magazine* began prominently featuring the boys from Philly in 1960.

Dick Clark introduced another young singer on *American Bandstand* in 1958 who became one of the most popular featured columnists in *16 Magazine* in its early years. Connie Francis was the reigning female pop star of the early 1960s, appearing on numerous prime time variety shows, hosting her own television specials, and voted "Best Female Vocalist" by *American Bandstand* viewers for four consecutive years. After the massive success of her first single "Who's Sorry Now?" (1958), Francis became a highly sought-after live performer, and was the youngest star to headline shows at New York's Copacabana and in Las Vegas. She was also the first female singer to sell a million copies of a single, 1958's "Stupid Cupid."⁶³ After the early whirlwind of Francis's fame ebbed, she became more accessible to Gloria Stavers, who utilized Francis in the same fashion as she had Barbara Hearn – a trusted advisor for the magazine's readers. Connie Francis became *16 Magazine's* reigning advice doyenne in the early 1960s, and was the first such columnist to be granted the title of "Secret Sister" by Gloria Stavers. Though her chart success waned in the United States, Francis was still a popular celebrity with whom girls could identify, and she presented herself as a young woman who could relate to the problems and concerns girls faced. In her "Your Secret Sister" column, Francis answered letters from readers that pleaded for advice on how to cope with shyness, awkwardness around boys, difficulties with parents and siblings, confusion about school and careers, and just about anything else that worried a young lady.

Francis continued as a “Secret Sister” in *16 Magazine* until 1965, long past her Top 40 popularity, but still trusted as someone who had “been there.”

A shift occurred in the mid-1960s away from independently popular female stars. By late 1965, “girl stars were only interesting if they were ‘related’ to a boy. Instead of the independent Hayley [Mills], Connie [Francis], and Annette [Funicello], we got Beatle-birds Jane [Asher], Pattie [Boyd], and Maureen [Cox].”⁶⁴ Female stars were featured primarily in fashion and style columns, especially if they were British and dating a popular musician. The only women included among the pin-ups between 1964 and 1966 were Jane Asher and Pattie Boyd, who were dating Paul McCartney and George Harrison, respectively.⁶⁵

“Wanna Go To Dreamsville?”

In early 1964, *16 Magazine* underwent a major transition, though the readers likely never noticed a difference as they read about their “fave raves.” The March 1964 issue still lists “Georgia Winters” as Editor, but quietly introduces a new figure in its masthead: “Gloria Stavers, Consulting Editor.” With the April 1964 issue, Gloria Stavers officially was listed as Editor-in-Chief, and would remain so until 1972. However, “Georgia Winters” was still listed as a “Consulting Editor” and remained so until 1968.

The official transition to Gloria Stavers directing the magazine’s content and messages under her own name coincided with other changes for *16 Magazine* as well. The March 1964 issue introduced another major cultural shift for girl culture – and global popular culture as a whole – with *16 Magazine*’s first

coverage of The Beatles, hitting newsstands and mailboxes weeks before their landmark appearance on *The Ed Sullivan Show*. Most of the stars of 1963 would lose their popularity and coverage in *16 Magazine*, unable to compete with the marketing appeal of The Beatles and their British Invasion brethren. Paul Petersen, George Chakiris, Richard Chamberlain, Shelley Fabares, Ann-Margret, and the other television and movie stars who received significant magazine coverage would fall to the wayside, and musicians would become the focus of *16 Magazine* in 1964 and beyond.

The February 1964 issue introduced one of *16 Magazine's* most popular and most enduring features with the headline "Wanna Go To Dreamsville? Then make a WISH – and make it NOW!"⁶⁶ "A Trip to Dreamsville" was the monthly feature that allowed readers – or "customers," as Stavers called them – to fantasize about what possessions they wanted from their favorite stars. After writing letters to Gloria Stavers requesting those items, a small number of readers were awarded their prizes, and often *more* than they requested. An example of the invitation to "Dreamsville" highlights many of the ways in which "Fairy Godmother" Gloria Stavers offered to facilitate her readers' fantasies, while paving the way for their consumer development:

CLOSE YOUR EYES and make a WISH then send it to
DREAMSVILLE WHERE WISHES COME TRUE!

... you're our customer for a free one-way ticket to Dreamsville ... the place where *all* wishes come true! So c'mon and climb aboard our Heavenly Express! All you need is a dream – and a cross-your-heart, hope-to-die wish that it becomes a thrilling reality! ... You name it – and *16 Magazine* will wave its magic wand and stop at nothing to deliver your dream right to your doorstep! ... Don't hold

back because you think your dream is impossible to fulfill. Let *16 Magazine* be the judge of that. Just look into your heart and pick out the biggest dream you can find ... After you've mailed us your letter, be sure to get every issue of *16 Magazine* and watch the Dreamsville answers page for the announcement that your dream will come true!⁶⁷

Stavers decided which consumer dreams were fulfilled through the “Dreamsville” feature, but always encouraged her readers to fantasize, hope, and strive to achieve their dreams. Stavers never put limitations on the expectations and desires of her readers. Instead, she urged them to broaden their imaginations, suggesting that no dream was impossible to achieve – at least if *16 Magazine* (ultimately, Stavers herself) had access to it and could provide it.

Stavers gained readers' trust and confidence through her direct approach of communicating with them in her letters and columns, *16 Magazine's* positive depictions of female celebrities, and consistent reinforcement of the ways in which her readers could become unique and popular individuals. Stavers had faith that her readers were (or had the potential to be) the “smart girls,” in intellect, demeanor, and style, touted in the magazine's masthead, and treated them accordingly. The pages of *16 Magazine* provided a space for girls to express their concerns and confusions about adolescence, as well as to create fantasies about their favorite stars. These fantasies were the bases of most of the feature content in the magazine and, through them, Stavers introduced and perpetuated the belief that male pop stars were accessible and relationships with them, whether social or romantic, were attainable. Gloria Stavers crafted *16 Magazine* in very specific ways to encourage normative American behaviors in

her readers, each of which could be attained through consumerism: fantasies of heterosexual relationships, enhancing “appropriate” femininity, and cultivating individuality that aligned with conventional values. Though the “A Trip to Dreamsville” feature did not debut until early 1964, Stavers already had established the features and themes that reinforced the elements of “Dreamsville” itself in the earlier years of her tenure as editor.

Consumerism also influenced how *16 Magazine*’s readers considered their connections to their idols. The ways in which girls could claim “ownership” of their favorite stars were wide-ranging. Of course, they could buy records, become members of fan clubs, and collect pin-ups – but those were superficial ways to bring their “fave raves” into their homes. Within the figurative “Dreamsville” cultivated in the pages of *16 Magazine*, girls could delve into stars’ deepest thoughts, find out secrets about their childhoods, learn their loves and hates, find out what they like in girls, and tour their homes. Readers of *16 Magazine* could get close to their pop idols in ways other magazines could never provide, primarily due to the respect and influence Gloria Stavers held within the music industry. As readers found out deep, personal secrets about their favorite stars, they believed they had a better chance of “getting them” – whether that meant understanding the stars on a deeply personal level, or actually entering into personal relationships with them. The stars themselves told readers exactly what they wanted – or at least it certainly seemed so, within the articles that sometimes were ghost-written by Stavers herself. The stars wrote letters to their fans in their own handwriting – telling each and every reader why she was “the

one” he wanted. If the fantasy of being the star’s girlfriend wasn’t enough, there often were opportunities to acquire some piece of that star’s life – a shirt, an autograph, maybe even a phone call or face-to-face meeting - through a “trip to Dreamsville.” Gloria Stavers, with cooperation from the most popular stars of the 1960s, encouraged girls to become consumers, not only of tangible goods, but also of the stars themselves. Under the guise of romantic fantasy, girls were conditioned to dream of, pursue, and acquire celebrities and the commodities that accompanied them. Throughout the process, the influences of consumerism and popular culture permeated the pages of *16 Magazine* and were incorporated into American girl culture.

NOTES

1. Gloria Stavers, quoted in John Burks and Jerry Hopkins, *Groupies and Other Girls* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), 94.
2. Richard Ohmann, *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century* (London: Verso, 1996), 238.
3. Ellen Gruber Garvey, *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 43.
4. Garvey, 5.
5. Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 119.
6. Cohen, 319.
7. Robert O. Carlson, "The Use of Public Relations Research by Large Corporations," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* (21:3), 345.
8. James Gilbert, *A Cycle of Outrage: America's Reaction to the Juvenile Delinquent in the 1950s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 10.
9. Ilana Nash, *American Sweethearts: Teenage Girls in Twentieth-Century Popular Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 136-137.
10. Kathryn Summers Powell and David A. Gover, "The Adolescent as a Consumer: Facts and Implications," *Marriage and Family Living* (25:3), 359. Emphasis included in original text.
11. Powell and Gover, 361.
12. Powell and Gover, 362-363.
13. Powell and Gover, 362.
14. Powell and Gover, 362.
15. Powell and Gover, 364.
16. Powell and Gover, 364. Emphasis included in original text.
17. Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields, *Who's Your Fave Rave?* (New York: Boulevard Books, 1997), vii.

-
18. Reisfeld and Fields, vii.
 19. "DIG this teenage life!" *DIG*, Jan 1958, 3. Lou Kimzey also published Modern Teen magazine during this era, and continued his publishing career with subcultural magazines targeting motorcycle enthusiasts.
 20. "Bull Session," *DIG*, January 1960, 30.
 21. "The Flang Report, Chapter One," *DIG*, September 1960, 12.
 22. "The Hen House," *DIG*, August 1960, 23.
 23. "Adrian Answers Your Questions!!" *DIG*, August 1961, 49.
 24. Lilly Cooper, "Problems," *DIG*, January 1958, 40.
 25. Lilly Cooper, "Problems," *DIG*, January 1958, 40.
 26. Lilly Cooper, "Problems," *DIG*, September 1958, 42-43.
 27. Lilly Cooper, "Problems," *DIG*, January 1958, 40.
 28. Lilly Cooper, "Problems," *DIG*, September 1958, 42-43.
 29. "Dig's Cloud 9," *DIG*, January 1960, 33.
 30. "Dig's Cloud 9," *DIG*, January 1960, 34-37.
 31. "Dig's Cloud 9," *DIG*, August 1960, 24.
 32. "Dig's Cloud 9," *DIG*, August 1960, 26-29.
 33. "Dig's Cloud 9," *DIG*, September 1960, 20-25.
 34. "Paper Mates," *DIG*, January 1960, 43.
 35. "Uncensored Teenage Opinions," *DIG*, August 1961, 28.
 36. "Uncensored Teenage Opinions," *DIG*, January 1960, 15.
 37. "Interesting Careers," *DIG*, January 1958, 17.

-
38. James Dean, Teen June 1957, Who's Dated Who.
http://www.whosdatedwho.com/tpx_9063673/teen-magazine-united-states-june-1957/. Accessed 21 October 2012.
39. 'Teen, June 1959, 4.
40. 'Teen, May 1963, cover.
41. Table of Contents, 'Teen, June 1959, 4.
42. Masthead, 'Teen, July 1964, 4.
43. Burks and Hopkins, 94.
44. Reisfeld and Fields, 41.
45. Masthead, *16 Magazine*, November 1964, 7.
46. Burks and Hopkins, 95.
47. Reisfeld and Fields, 41.
48. Burks and Hopkins, 95.
49. Reisfeld and Fields, xi.
50. Reisfeld and Fields, viii.
51. Reisfeld and Fields, ix-x.
52. Reisfeld and Fields, 1.
53. Reisfeld and Fields, xi.
54. Reisfeld and Fields, ix.
55. "You're Telling Me!" column, featured in each issue of *16 Magazine* during Gloria Stavers' tenure as editor-in-chief. Initially, "You're Telling Me!" was credited to "Georgia Winters," Stavers's pseudonym. It transitioned to the Gloria Stavers byline in April 1964.
56. Simon Frith, *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock 'n' Roll* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), 227-228.
57. Frith, 228-231.

-
58. Frith, 226.
59. Angela McRobbie, *Feminism and Youth Culture: From "Jackie" to "Just Seventeen"* (Cambridge, MA: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1991), 131.
60. Reisfeld and Fields, xi.
61. It was not until January 1969 that 16 added internal glossy pin-ups to its content.
62. Dick Clark, in Reisfeld and Fields, xiv.
63. "Biography." [conniefrancis.com](http://www.conniefrancis.com/#!bio3/c4cl). <http://www.conniefrancis.com/#!bio3/c4cl>
Accessed 24 November 2013.
64. Reisfeld and Fields, 41.
65. Jane Asher's pin-up was included in the November 1964 issue, and Pattie Boyd's was included in the March 1965 issue.
66. "Wanna Go To Dreamsville?" *16 Magazine*, February 1964, 29.
67. "Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, October 1965, 22.

**Buying Into the British invasion:
Using Pop Stars to Cultivate Femininity and Consumer Behavior**

1964-1966

“Beauty has two sides – the exterior and the interior ... But you must keep this fact in mind – inner beauty is the most important of the two. No matter how pretty a doll is painted, if it is made out of bad goods it will soon deteriorate and be worthless.” – Gloria Stavers¹

The popular media found an avid, receptive, and responsive audience in teenage girls, but also utilized them as effective subjects with whom they could represent and expound upon broader social concerns and challenges. This chapter focuses on the affinity for popular stars, encouragement of consumer behavior, expressions of personal style, and negotiations of fractured femininity that converged in *16 Magazine* in the mid-1960s. By 1966, *16 Magazine* had a circulation estimated at over seven million readers per month and, according to *Rolling Stone*, “*16* ha[d] a circulation five times as great as any of its competitors – *Tiger Beat*, *Flip*, *Teen Screen*, *Fave* and others.”² *16 Magazine* was a highly coveted publicity vehicle for major pop music and television stars, and was perceived as the most influential mass media outlet, aside from *The Ed Sullivan Show*, that could make or break a new entertainer’s career for a teenage audience.

Cultural producers represented and interpreted the symbolic figure of the teenage girl as a confused, frenetic, white, middle-class, young female, with all of the broader connotations associated with those terms. The concept itself of who

she should be and what her character should encompass, in a general sense – what behaviors were “appropriate,” to what goals could she aspire – was debated, contested, and gradually broadening. She was beyond the toys and carefree whims of childhood, but not savvy with the duties and responsibilities of womanhood. Her socially fractured figure was dispersed between her age-determined student and daughter roles and her gender-determined social roles as confidant and date for her female and male peers, respectively. Meanwhile, the individuals girls themselves were progressing through the life stage of adolescence, filled with personal changes, uncertainties, and upheavals of its own.

In the midst of these disjunctions, girls were also in training to become civic consumers, the future wives and mothers struggling to comprehend the duties and responsibilities that defined these roles in an ever-changing social context permeated with Cold War-era fears of social deviance and political subversion. The teenaged girl's literal figure, her physical body, was scrutinized as well, with her physical development on display and her emerging sexuality simultaneously encouraged and contained by the culture around her. Her physique, her clothing, and the beauty products she used accentuated her femininity, the visible importance of which was emphasized by the society around her; yet that same society's mores urged restraint in romantic relationships and frowned upon her sexual maturation. The popular media promoted and perpetuated the chaos that surrounded the teenage girl, while it courted her as a young buyer of goods, which would ease her domestic responsibilities and signify

her individual tastes while she engaged in leisure and entertainment activities.³ The conflicts that teenage girls faced were not nearly as concise as those identified and extended through the media. To be sure, teenage girls dealt with all of these issues at varying levels of importance and consequence to their own specific situations. However, as the media, social institutions, and marketers perpetuated hopes and fears about the erratic and impulsive behaviors of American teenagers, teenage girls became a predominant focus of the perils and possibilities facing American youth during the mid-century decades.

The figure, both symbolic and literal, of the teenage girl was the center of convergence for several major developments during the twentieth century, especially the promotion of a popular media culture, social concerns regarding gender and sexuality, and the evolution of consumer culture which focused on demographic, identity, and taste distinctions. These developments emerged gradually in the early decades of the century, but attained a visible and dominant influence in the 1950s and 1960s. During these decades, teenagers became an extremely valuable and volatile peer group promoted by the media, analyzed by institutional figureheads, courted by advertisers, and criticized by all three sectors. The malleable, undecipherable “teenager,” treated as a oversimplified image and stripped of individuality by society at large, was actively engaged with popular culture, a potential consumer armed with disposable income and erratic tastes who had matured beyond being subject to authoritative decisions of parents, yet had not fully evolved into socially responsible adult. The instability of the teenager’s interests and identity, contextualized by a culture that highly

valued America's youth as the hopeful bearers of a safe and strong American democracy of the future, led major cultural producers to focus on the teen demographic as a primary audience, analytical subject, and profit generator. However, the teenage *girl* was the most lucrative subject for the mass media, marketers, and manufacturers, as her role(s) in a rapidly changing and socially unstable American culture was most critical and highly contested.

A number of television sitcoms featuring teenage girl protagonists hit the airwaves in the mid-1960s, with varying degrees of popularity and longevity. *The Patty Duke Show*, which aired on ABC from 1963 to 1966, achieved the highest ratings of the shows in this genre; it also presented the complexities of the teenager, specifically the variety of expectations and roles accorded to the teenage girl, in a unique way. Academy Award-winning teen actress Patty Duke portrayed two characters in the show: "identical cousins" Patty and Cathy Lane. American Patty was a "typical" teenage girl from Brooklyn Heights, New York, who was fashionable, popular with boys and girls in her high school, loved pop music and dancing, and was a devoted daughter, sister, and girlfriend. Cathy, a transplanted foreigner with a vaguely British accent who lived with Patty's family, was intelligent, respectful, showed exquisite taste, and displayed impeccable reason and behavior in trying situations – yet seemed rather awkward and confused when faced with "fitting in" with her American peers. While Patty was the lead character upon whom most episodes focused, Cathy served as a necessary contrast to highlight the intricacies of appearance, behavior, and demeanor that teenage girls needed to navigate.

An episode from the first season of *The Patty Duke Show*, originally aired in March 1964, encapsulated not only the essence of the program and dynamics between the characters, but also serves as an example of how mass media producers assessed the complexities of the teenage girl in this era. In “The Wedding Anniversary Caper,” Patty’s brother, Ross, submits greatly exaggerated biography of his sister to a teen beauty contest, unbeknownst to Patty. His goal is to win the grand prize, a television set that they could give their parents as an anniversary present. When Patty is contacted to compete as a finalist in the Miss Teenage contest, she agrees only because the prize would provide her parents with a fantastic gift. When it becomes clear that Ross attributed talents and skills to Patty that she could not hope to effectively show to the judges, Cathy – the cultured and highly educated foreigner – steps in to address the judges in foreign languages and sing an opera aria. Patty shows her winning charm and personality by tap dancing and singing an American pop song. The judges are thrilled with the range of “Patty’s” talents and award her the Miss Teenage title and the television set. Of course, all three teens realize the dishonor in how they won the award, admit their deceit to their parents and judges, and return the prize, ultimately winning the respect and admiration of their parents. The most revealing aspect of this episode’s plot and its exposition is that in order to be considered the “ultimate teenager,” TWO individual girls with radically different upbringings and completely contrasting personalities had to merge their knowledge, skills, and savvy to appease the adult authorities who judged them. While produced for laughs within the parameters of a sitcom, this episode – and

many others in which Patty and Cathy work together to conquer problems – exposed the wide range of expectations and assumptions regarding teenage girls that came from analysts and pundits in this era, and especially how one single girl could not hope to achieve the expectations placed upon her by society at large.⁴ As succinctly stated in another episode, after Patty scored incredibly low on a magazine quiz assessing the “perfect” teenager, “The world judges you on how you look, walk, and talk.”⁵

16 Magazine was the most popular teen-oriented celebrity magazine in America, catering to a readership consisting primarily of pre-teen and teenage girls while reinforcing social norms and conventions. In a 1969 *Rolling Stone* profile, *16 Magazine*'s audience was described as “90 to 95 percent girls.” Gloria Stavers described the age cohort of her readers as well: “The average reader’s age is about 14... but it fluctuates between 13.7 and 14.8. We have a lot of readers who are 11, but it seems to drop off considerably at about 16. When a girl reaches that age, she gets more interested in the boy next door and moves out of the *16* world, which, in a sense, is highly imaginative on their part.”⁶ *16 Magazine* sought a slightly younger audience than *Seventeen*, and featured popular music and television stars, rather than fashions. *Seventeen* served as a guide for teenage girls in negotiating their roles as fashionable students, future wives and mothers, and responsible citizens, while becoming consumers who enhanced their femininity and individual style with a wide variety of advertised goods.⁷ *16 Magazine* also reinforced the dominant cultural norms regarding female gender roles, yet presented these ideologies in features that presented

“appropriate” appearances and behaviors under the guise of celebrity profiles, advice columns, and informal endorsements of products and trends.

Rather than having its content influenced by outside advertisers, Gloria Stavers, the editor of *16 Magazine* from 1958 to 1975, determined how the magazine represented the fractured figure of the teenage girl and which celebrities were used as models for the variant roles. As Dick Clark noted, “Gloria expanded on the truth and made it into the mold of what she thought her audience wanted to see and read about. She created the images.”⁸ Gloria Stavers recognized and comprehended a normative girl culture and utilized the features in *16 Magazine* to create a variant of it that was accessible and understandable for her readers. However, Stavers also provided opportunities for girls to express their individuality and concerns in a positive, reassuring forum. In an interview featured in the 04 November 1967 issue of *The Saturday Evening Post*, Stavers expressed a genuine concern for her magazine’s readers and their struggles as they wrestled with the conflicting expectations placed upon them. In this feature, Stavers explained her motivation for including a significant amount of “advice” content in the magazine:

The problems [the readers] have are so simple they bring tears to my eyes... A lot of parents today are young, too, and many of them never seem to take the time to explain the little things that really matter. I get letters from girls who cry themselves to sleep every night because they’re so much in love with one Monkee or another. Their parents think it’s silly or simply don’t believe them. Well, I believe them, and I know what they’re going through. It hurts. We try to help.⁹

Stavers also indicated how she perceived her own role in the negotiations of fractured femininity among her young readers, stating, “Girls of eleven to fifteen are in a period of development more intense than any other period in their lives... By the time a girl reaches sixteen she’s ready to leave the dreamworld, and 16 is way behind her. But during those earlier years, I tell you true, that child is *mine*.”¹⁰ Stavers’s perception that she was serving as an emulous mother to her readers is crucial when analyzing the depictions of female celebrities in *16 Magazine*. Referring to her readers as “the future mothers of America,” Stavers ultimately acknowledged her goal of training girls to exhibit traits that would display and confirm their “place” in the normative American society of the Cold War era. Not only would these girls possibly become biological mothers individually, but they also would be the caretakers of the American mindset and lifestyle. However, Stavers astutely recognized that a generic representation of the conformist teenage girl was insufficient during an era of major social change and, aware of the age cohort of the magazine’s audience, included diverse depictions of the possible roles teenage girls could have and which younger readers could anxiously aspire to fulfill.

The diversity in such depictions became very apparent in 1964, as the British Invasion of musicians, models, and actors swept across the Atlantic and into American youth and popular culture. The Beatles’ arrival in America in February 1964 initiated the influence of British music and style on American youth, permeating popular media until roughly 1967, when acts such as The Beatles and the Rolling Stones were experimenting with psychedelic music and

exhibiting eccentric behaviors that suggested an affinity for countercultural ideologies. Their move towards anti-Establishment attitudes and behaviors afforded an opportunity for American acts, such as The Monkees, Paul Revere and the Raiders, and the Mamas and the Papas, to begin reclaiming some territory on the Top 40 charts and television screens, as well as in teen magazines. This is not to say, however, that only British acts were featured in *16 Magazine* between 1964 and 1967; rather, during this period a distinct trend emerged that reinforced broader political and social constructions of the era – specifically, the fractured alliance of British and American interests in the midst of the Cold War era.

Melani McAlister's analysis of the junctures in American political relationships with, and cultural depictions of, the Middle East illuminates the distance established between the United States and other Western nations since 1945. In *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, & U.S. Interests in the Middle East since 1945*, McAlister proposes a revision of Edward Said's "Orientalism," a new post-orientalized global alignment in which the United States segregated its political and cultural interests from those of European powers. This post-orientalized world required a repositioning of the "Other," including selective representations of the East, as well as a new "Othering" of the European West. According to McAlister, "after World War II, political and cultural conditions in the United States produced a post-Orientalist model of representing the Middle East for American audiences... [Even] the official rhetoric of nationalist expansionism worked to establish the United States as different from the old colonial powers,

and it did so in part by fracturing the East-West binary... [The] project of separating the United States from European imperialism... functioned strategically.”¹¹ While McAlister’s analysis focuses on American cultural representations of the Middle East during the Cold War era, her theses serve as useful references for American cultural self-awareness as a whole during the era. McAlister proposes that “cultural productions help make meanings by their historical association with other types of meaning-making activity.” As a result, “the production of knowledge occurs... through the internal logics of cultural practices, intersecting with the entirely interested activity of social agents” leading to “a process of convergence, in which historical events, overlapping representations, and diverse vested interests come together in a powerful and productive, if historically contingent, accord.”¹²

Separating American culture from British tastes and trends became a daunting task in 1964, as The Beatles’ popularity escalated and their media exposure expanded with an unprecedented scope and pace among youth culture. The previous decade’s experience with Elvis Presley provided some indication of how widely and quickly a pop star’s popularity could rise, and The Beatles were eyed at least as cautiously as Presley was, due in part to the particularly vulnerable state of the American populace, and especially its youth, in early 1964. When President John F. Kennedy was assassinated in November 1963, the United States entered a period of mourning that would continue indefinitely, highlighted by an outpouring of grief and sympathy, especially for

Kennedy's family. As the slain president's family grieved, the American people joined them simultaneously through the medium of live television.

The youth of America was especially affected by Kennedy's assassination; they had embraced Kennedy as *their* leader, a dynamic, young president who embodied the forward-looking goals and ideals that they sought. Kennedy also had encouraged the younger generation with his energy, enthusiasm, charm, and attractive presence. The feelings of loss and alienation that shrouded the nation as a result of the Kennedy assassination were unlike anything this generation of Americans ever had experienced. As Lyndon Johnson suddenly became the new president, the American public was presented with the opportunity to embrace a new icon, an icon that embodied hope for the future, while displaying a similar energy, enthusiasm, charm, and attractiveness that Kennedy had. America needed a catharsis after the assassination, and it came in the form of The Beatles. Lennon, McCartney, Harrison, and Starr "gratified America's need for a new idol, a new toy, a painkilling drug, and a laugh."¹³ According to Jim Curtis,

An American act which came on as brash and cocky, as they did, would have been perceived as lacking in respect for our fallen hero and for the sensibilities of the country at large. But they were British – emphatically and visibly so. They had no obligation to mourn, so they could toss off jokes and sing joyous love songs. Better still, we could laugh at them and clap our hands to the beat. Because they were British, they reassured us that it was okay to be happy again... Like him, they were young, handsome, witty, poised, self-assured... Like President Kennedy, the Beatles had an accent that marked them as different... For us, all British accents... meant elegance and sophistication.¹⁴

As the initial horror of the Kennedy assassination faded, the American public looked forward to the Beatles' arrival. Even for some adults, their arrival

was a welcome diversion from the trauma that the United States had suffered. For young Americans, however, their arrival represented a new beginning. The Beatles embodied much of the hope and vitality that Kennedy had represented, and the public eagerly anticipated their first encounter with the four men who already caused “Beatlemania” to erupt all over Europe.

The British Invasion and Mod Culture

Throughout the Cold War era, distinct subcultural and/or countercultural groups gained prominence for their critiques of normative behaviors and conventional lifestyles. These social and cultural movements, including the Beats, radical students and SDS, folk music, civil rights, Vietnam war protest, the Mods, and the Punks, counted young people in the majority of their contingent memberships. While inaccurate to claim that *all* or *exclusively* youth were members of these movements, the social and cultural strife that resulted as the media focused its attention on these issues clearly revealed generational ruptures. While young people previously accepted their rigidly structured generational roles with relatively minimal complaint, they quickly lost faith in the system that perpetuated such structures - and sought commiseration and community among their peers rather than their elders. Young people who favored the fashions and music of their generational peers rather than the staid, conformist styles produced by corporate industries disseminated the visual and aural signifiers associated with these oppositional groups throughout the broader youth culture. As ideological tensions flared between mainstream and

countercultural ideologues, the signifiers associated with the latter became convenient identifying characteristics by which the former could label and stereotype any young person who adopted these styles as modes of self-expression and personal taste.¹⁵

Youth culture began shifting rapidly and continuously during the 1960s, primarily to avoid assimilation into the normative society that previously co-opted superficial cultural signifiers and used them to coerce young people into accepting dominant ideologies in persistent attempts to repair fracturing social and political ideologies. The television and music industries attempted to negotiate these tensions by appealing to young people with trendy visual and aural signifiers while reinforcing mainstream ideologies and normative behaviors. Initially, they found great success with this approach, but when youth culture shifted its pervasive ideology to the importance of self-expression among peers rather than conformist acceptance by authorities, these negotiations frequently broke down and produced resistant texts that assisted in the coherence of an oppositional youth culture. One of the earliest such oppositional cultures of the 1960s was England's Mods.

The Mod movement was rooted in the social conflicts that affected England in the post-World War II era. The rise of the middle class, the fracture of youth from previous generations, and an obsession with elements of modern life were key factors that propelled the Mod movement. The Mods were young people who fully embraced the commodity culture of the 1960s and used it effectively to distinguish themselves, both within their subculture and to external

observers. They utilized the street and the city for their own needs, and they brought leisure time to the forefront of their lives. *As Ready! Steady! Go!*, Britain's most popular youth-oriented television show in the 1960s, announced, "The Weekend Starts Now!" For many Mods, the "weekend" was not defined by the calendar – it was a mindset and a lifestyle, and these young people held jobs to fund their "weekends," not for career advancement or personal fulfillment. The Mods publicly displayed their class and politics, turning signifiers of the older generation against itself, often in the most visible and stylish ways possible. However, the Mod movement quickly shifted from its sociopolitical roots and became a style in itself, as the fashion signifiers themselves were commodified and incorporated into youth culture around the world.

The English Mod movement of the 1960s produced some of the most memorable visual images from its era. The mini-skirt, Mary Quant's op-art dresses, and Vidal Sassoon's pixie haircuts are cultural signifiers of the youth and spirit that permeated London and influenced youth around the world. Ringo Starr was famously asked, in the 1964 Beatles' film *A Hard Day's Night*, "Are you a Mod or a Rocker?" His response was, "No, I'm a Mocker." In 1966, Ray Davies offered a scathing critique of the "Carnabetian Army" that the Mod movement quickly was becoming in the Kinks' song "A Dedicated Follower of Fashion." While the Mod soundtrack produced some of the most memorable music of the era, there initially was much more to the Mod movement than stylish clothing and catchy music. However, by the end of the 1960s, the icons of the Mod movement had merged into popular culture and lost their subcultural

significance as they became part of the commodity culture themselves. Twiggy, “The Face” of Swinging London and the fashion industry’s first working-class model, had her own clothing line, as well as numerous toys, beauty products, and lunch boxes that bore her image. The Who, leaders of the Mod music movement, became one of the most profitable rock bands of the era, playing arenas around the world and performing rock operas. Vidal Sassoon marketed his own line of hair care products in convenience stores, and Mary Quant’s name and corporate logo adorned clothing, cosmetics, and accessories for decades.

A *modern* movement is one that breaks with tradition. The British Mod movement clearly broke with tradition and attempted to mock the very tradition that it rejected. In addition, it served as a precedent for global youth movements that ensued, in organization and attitude if not so much in fashion. According to Simon Frith, “... the Mods seemed to have a secret that made adults irrelevant... [and] unlike their adult observers, were well aware of the distinctions within their community.”¹⁶ In the early stage of the movement, before 1963, the Mods were generally middle class sons of businessmen who worked solely to earn money to perpetuate their lifestyle. As consumer culture flourished in the decades following World War II, youth in general, and the Mods specifically, embraced it. However, Mods found the work ethics of their parents pointless and refused to acquiesce to a conformist middle class lifestyle. “The job itself had precious little intrinsic importance... [they] used the profits of their dead-end jobs to maximize their real lives: at play.”¹⁷ Mods expressed a “disdainful refusal not of the fruits of the consumer society but of the traditional means – hard work, servile gratitude,

sacrifice and dedication – for obtaining them.”¹⁸ The Mods lived for their leisure time, and as such, flipped traditional notions of time organization. Work was of secondary significance; it merely was a way to fund an excessive leisure lifestyle. Extreme measures were taken to ensure optimum amounts of leisure time, including consumption of a wide variety of stimulants, including barbiturates or “speed,” to prevent exhaustion. In her autobiography, Twiggy noted, “Not drinking was part of being a Mod. These were the days of Coca Cola and purple hearts.”¹⁹

Mods were perhaps the most conspicuous consumers of the 20th century. Their subculture was identified easily through visual signifiers, especially fashion. Visual imagery, through dress, makeup, and accessories, was the most indelible element of the Mod movement. While the Mods rejected middle class conformity, they adapted the “uniform” of the middle class businessman to their own culture. By 1963, the movement broadened and attracted more working class youth. As the Mod movement expanded and incorporated working class youth, the significance of the “uniform” took on new meaning. “Frequently tied to menial jobs, forced to pay for their clothes on weekly installments... they nevertheless made ‘furious consumption’ the conspicuous motif of their style... The adult world was locked out not by fashions... but through an exaggerated *neatness* and consumerism which adults could only dimly understand...”²⁰

While the visual culture of Mod clothing and cosmetics featured the stark optical contrasts of black and white, popular music merged the sounds of black and white culture together. In one of the most enduring features of Mod culture,

the musicians affiliated with the movement produced music that incorporated aspects of American blues, jazz, and soul, with a white working-class frenetic quality. The Beatles and Rolling Stones, while not technically Mods, were incorporated into the later stages of the Mod movement as it broadened culturally throughout London. Nonetheless, the popularity of The Beatles' combination of American soul and British Merseybeat and the Rolling Stones' interpretations of Delta blues with a London sound successfully merged black and white music styles and re-presented it to an eager global youth audience. The Beatles and Rolling Stones also opened the doors for the British Invasion of American youth culture, and provided entry for Mod musicians to gain popularity with a youth audience as well. The most representative Mod band was The Who, comprised of members of the Mod movement who incorporated numerous Mod signifiers into their image and their sound. The most obvious Mod representation is in The Who's rhythm and blues-influenced early work, merging black and white music styles as The Beatles and Rolling Stones (and numerous other bands) had. However, as The Who progressed through the 1960s, they incorporated elements of the later stages of the Mod movement as well. Their early stage attire featured op-art designs; their later designs came directly from Carnaby Street, including guitarist Pete Townshend's memorable Union Jack jacket. As described by Peter Wicke,

The Who seemed to [the Mods] the very incarnation of their concept of rock music, and they were also the first band to adopt in their overall appearance the pattern of cultural use of music developed by the fans instead of merely providing the musical object of this use.²¹

The Who, then, are representative of the later features of the Mod movement, as it lost its class distinctions and blended the affluent with the working class, the stylists with the consumers, the idols with the fans. This later stage of the Mod movement “erased the line between the public and the star... you had to have the look, the commitment and the means, and you were in.”²² This removal of distinction “between the public and the star” was a key element that Gloria Stavers incorporated into *16 Magazine*’s “Dreamsville,” an integrated community (albeit imaginary) of young people - of girls and fave raves and secret sisters - without class distinctions or social obstacles to keep them from living and learning together.

This incredibly vibrant youth movement, replete with attractive young stars, distinctly different fashions, and a catchy soundtrack, appealed to young people around the world – but, very notably, its social and political perspectives, critiques, and attitudes did *not* translate across the Atlantic. As British trends invaded American youth culture, and especially American teen magazines, the *behavior* of the Mods was not promoted. As the Mods and Rockers gained wider notoriety in Western culture, *16 Magazine* provided an introduction to its readers to help them make sense of what was happening in England. In the January 1965 issue, a printed “conversation” between British singer Dusty Springfield and American singer Lesley Gore provided *16 Magazine*’s readers with a “bird’s eye” perspective derived from the questions of a “secret sister.” In “Dusty Tells Lesley All About Mods & Rockers,” the social conflicts between youth subcultures in England were reduced to matters of fashion and style, while concepts of social

unrest in England are introduced, but ultimately trivialized for the audience as merely “boys” fighting, as they do everywhere.

WHAT ARE THEY? Where do they come from? Lend an ear to this conversation piece between Dusty Springfield and Lesley Gore – and you’ll get hipped to the facts!

LESLEY: “Hey, Dusty, what’s all the noise in England about Mods and Rockers?”

DUSTY: “Oh, it’s all part of our big ‘social revolution.’”

LESLEY: “How come ‘revolution’?”

DUSTY: “It’s the end of an age when the class were divided by money and birth.”

LESLEY: “And they aren’t any longer?”

DUSTY: “Relatively, the working class – as it used to be called – is as well off as the so-called middle class. The kids from working-class homes can make good money in a factory. The kids from better social circumstances take jobs in offices.”

LESLEY: “And which is which?”

DUSTY: “*Mods* tend to have the office jobs. *Rockers* are the factory boys and girls.”

LESLEY: “And how do you tell them apart?”

DUSTY: “That’s easy. *Mods* are the stylish dressers. Clothes mean *everything* to them, and their fashions change almost from day to day. *Rockers* stick to a basic uniform of jeans and leather jackets.”

The conversation continued about the fashions and trends of Mod and Roker girls and boys. Ultimately, Gore questioned the conflicts between the groups:

LESLEY: “But why do they fight when they meet, these *Mods* and *Rockers*?”

DUSTY: “Don’t ask me! Why do boys fight anywhere? To show their newfound virility. To prove they’re boss of their own particular walk. Perhaps, in the case of *Mods* and *Rockers*, it’s the dying gasp of an out-dated class system that’s been turned upside down by the New Britain!”²³

A few months later, John Lennon also addressed the Mods in *16*

Magazine, after a reader asked him “Are the Mods a certain group of people or a term for a certain type of person? What is a Mod?” Lennon’s response was “A

Mod is a smart dresser who is quiet and plays it cool.”²⁴ Jill Stuart provided another insight to conflict in England, hinting at generational differences:

Everyone in London seems to be indignant at the moment over the proposed plans for the modernization of Piccadilly Circus – it is going to be on three levels, with shops and walk-aways on two levels, and lots of room for traffic underneath. The feeling is that this famous old piece of London is going to look too glossy and efficient, and we like our traffic jams the way they are – terribly slow and typically English.²⁵

These references to subversion in British culture and society are notable because *16 Magazine* generally avoided any discussion of political or social conflict in the United States. Introducing American girls to social conflicts in England is a curious maneuver that cannot go unnoticed – especially when it becomes clear that a significant youth movement was distilled down to varying fashion styles. This approach served as a precedent for how Gloria Stavers would incorporate subcultural and countercultural movements in *16 Magazine* for the remainder of the 1960s. These references also serve as clear indicators of the “us and them” approach to British celebrities that *16 Magazine* practiced throughout the 1960s; the need to explain these “different” types of young people indicated that they were not acting in a familiar manner, that they behaved differently, perhaps inappropriately, and they should not be emulated for behavior. During an era of significant social unrest and conflict, including the civil rights movement, the Vietnam War and its protests, student movements, and the women’s rights movement, *16 Magazine* never made more than passing references to American social conditions, as such nontraditional and “different” behavior was considered too heavy or not appropriate for its readers. Those

countercultural movements indicated a different sort of “us and them” – with “them” being the subversive young people whose behavior was not in alignment with the overriding social and political agendas of the era.

The British Invade *16 Magazine*

In the mid-1960s, the vast majority of the stars featured in *16 Magazine* were British musicians who were part of the “British Invasion” of the American music charts. However, preference was given to the “safe” singers and bands whom would most suitably fit into young girls’ fantasies – or at least those whom Gloria Stavers deemed most suitable for young girls’ fantasies. The most popular musicians featured in *16 Magazine* during this period were The Beatles. They first were featured in *16 Magazine*’s March 1964 issue, which went to press in November 1963 and hit newsstands in January 1964, weeks before their resounding success on Ed Sullivan’s television show.²⁶ Over the next few years, Stavers secured numerous exclusive features from The Beatles and their friends. According to her staffers, “This was one of the few times when Gloria had to be truly aggressive to get material on a popular phenomenon, and she welcomed the challenge.”²⁷ The Beatles themselves understood and acknowledged the importance of *16 Magazine*’s influence on their success. Paul McCartney recalled,

We were aware of *16 Magazine* even before we came to America. We knew it was America’s greatest teen magazine. We knew we needed to be in it, although we thought of it as ‘cutesville on ice.’ I remember Gloria as being very dignified, very professional, totally businesslike. She inspired respect from all of us.²⁸

As The Beatles' popularity soared, so did *16 Magazine's* circulation figures and its status as the preeminent teen celebrity magazine at the time. Stavers recognized and took advantage of this connection. *16 Magazine* featured The Beatles as its primary stars through 1966, when a variety of factors affected their prominence in the magazine. The band stopped touring, focused on progressive music in the studio, acknowledged drug use, and, perhaps most confusing to the *16 Magazine* audience, matured and grew moustaches. In addition, their "three year cycle" of pop stardom (using Vance Packard's terminology) was ending, and as their fans matured, new "fave raves" were introduced for new readers of *16 Magazine*. However, as early as 1965, Stavers prepared her readers for the future in "Have the Beatles Changed?" an article that enhanced its legitimacy with Stavers's name in the by-line.

True, the Beatles, or any other person or persons, inevitably change as time goes by. Change is what makes life exciting and challenging. The Beatles *are* changing. They change a little each day – along with the rest of us. But what's important to remember is that the Beatles are not changing in a negative way – they are growing in a positive way. And Beatle People are growing with them – the squares will just have to fall by the wayside!²⁹

In 1965, Paul Revere and the Raiders were introduced to a national audience on daytime television's *Where the Action Is* and became immensely popular with readers of *16 Magazine*. By late 1966, The Monkees emerged on television and vinyl as America's most intense response to The Beatles, and were the most heavily featured stars in *16 Magazine* through the remainder of the decade.

Gloria Stavers's role as guardian of her readers' fantasies, as well as her determination for exclusives, likely influenced her lack of interest in England's

second most phenomenally successful artists, the Rolling Stones. The Rolling Stones were the “bad boys” of the British Invasion; their scruffy appearance and indifferent attitudes did not coalesce with Stavers’s ideas of ideal boys for her readers’ fantasies. Beyond that, according to one of her staffers, “when Gloria was clearly to be only one of many photographers in a situation, she lost interest. For her, it was a *16* exclusive, or nothing at all.”³⁰ Nonetheless, the Rolling Stones were successful pop stars, and featuring them did please some of her readers.

The Rolling Stones were introduced in *16 Magazine* in August 1964 as “sloppy, pallid, unkempt, and weird-looking” in “Has England Gone Too Far?” With a request to “write and tell us what YOU think!” Stavers offered the Stones to readers to gauge their interest in the band.³¹ The following month, the Stones were described as “the despair of that huge group of rigid adults who think youngsters should do what they are told to do and not ask questions... [and] the symbol of the new kind of independence and self-expression that is beginning to sweep England and America.” Hinting at the Mod attitude toward generational differences, a sentiment not directly related to the Stones followed: “Out with the old, and in with the new – and don’t drag me a lot of meaningless rules and regulations,’ is what seems to be the cry of many kids today.” Stavers did not explicitly support nor condemn this attitude, but by incorporating it in a feature entitled “The Rolling Stones – They Get Away With MURDER!!” certainly connected it to a darker, “naughtier” mindset than that represented by The Beatles in the magazine. However, Stavers contrasted that description by noting

“the Stones are not the crackpots some adults are trying to make them out to be. Each one is extremely intelligent. They are very hard-working, serious musicians, and they are particularly gifted and kindly young men.”³² Offering readers the opportunity to make their own decisions about the band and whether they belonged in the reader’s “Dreamsville,” Stavers continued to provide coverage of the Rolling Stones over the next few years in features such as “The Rolling Stones Answer 200 Intimate Questions!”; “The Rolling Stones Fight Back!”; “The Top Secret Love Lives of the Rolling Stones!!!”; and “At Home with the Rolling Stones.” Notably, the girlfriends of the Stones did *not* receive much coverage, aside from mentions in the gossip columns. However, as the Stones followed a similar path as The Beatles with drug arrests, more progressive music, and maturity and facial hair, they gradually disappeared from the pages of *16 Magazine*. The Beatles and the Rolling Stones continued to have their music promoted in *16 Magazine* through the end of the decade, usually among Stavers’s monthly “recommended albums” in the “GeeGee’s Gossip” column, but rarely were included in feature articles after 1966 – unless they were socializing with newer popular artists, such as The Monkees.

The Beatles and other artists popularized broader British styles and trends among American audiences, and Stavers incorporated those aspects into the editorial content of *16 Magazine*. British terminology was introduced to American audiences in *16 Magazine*’s articles, both through quotes from celebrities and in “instructional” features. In April 1965, *16 Magazine* provided a lesson for its readers to “Learn ‘Liddypool Scouse’ The Language of the Beatles!” In this

feature, popular British slang terminology was listed along with American definitions. Using this language would signify a girl among her peers as trendy and wise to the nuances of British youth culture, or so *16 Magazine* had her believe: “The beloved Beatles have sent every American bird off rambling madly in the “language of the Beatles.” Gear is almost old hat – and since we all have to keep up on the very latest from the land of the Beatles, here are some new, wacky, way-out words to add to your collection...”³³

16 Magazine also included articles and columns from “regular” English teenagers, giving American girls insight to what it was like to be living as a teenager in the homeland of their British “fave raves.” The September 1964 issue included “My 3 Days With The Beatles” written by “Tina Williams, An English Teenaged Girl,” who had a bit part acting in The Beatles’ first film, *A Hard Day’s Night*.³⁴ “English Trends & Friends,” a feature written by Janis Murray, provided news on up-and-coming bands and new fashion trends, as well as addresses for English pen pals. Another column titled “London NOW!” appeared several times during the heyday of the British Invasion, discussing new bands, popular designers, emerging actors, and trendy shops and clubs.

Female celebrities from England were credited authors of columns that clued in American girls to the rapidly changing phrases and slang that were popular in London, as well as confirming the perception that using such language among their friends would signify girls as members of a hip subculture. During the 1960s, Jane Asher, Pattie Boyd, Jill Stuart, Twiggy, Chrissie Shrimpton, and Marianne Faithfull were credited as authors in *16 Magazine*; their legitimacy was

borne of their connections to the “Swinging London” scene and their relationships with various Beatles, Rolling Stones, and other musicians. “Jill Stuart’s ‘Letter from London’” included references to styles that would identify girls as part of the “English set.” For example,

The big rage in England right now is the Courreges’ look – very short, skimpy dresses... worn with short white boots, often toe-less with bows on top... Lucky New Yorkers! Vidal Sasoon, our fave English hair cutter-and-dresser, is now in New York City. He has a fab shop on Madison Avenue, so now many of you can get “the real thing.”³⁵

British culture and lingo were incorporated into *16 Magazine’s* contest features too. Veiled within a fantasy and encouraging consumer development, Stavers presented one of the most evident examples of the intersection of American girl culture, pop music, and British culture: “Peter & Gordon’s Carnaby Street Shopping Spree Giveaway!”

WHEW! WHAM! KERBLAMM! It’s P&G – and guess where they’ve come from? From a gigantic shopping spree straight up and down London’s world-famous Carnaby Street – the hippest-flippiest mod gear area in existence, that’s all! They’ve gone stark crackers and bought up half the town, you know. And just who did they have in mind when they went wild on Carnaby? Why, no one but YOU – that’s WHO, teenie-ducks. So read on, sit back and *smile* – cos you’re on “Carnaby Camera” (and it’s all free, *free*, SUPER-FREE, luv!).³⁶

British Birds and Secret Sisters

If we understand that the United States pursued a distinct, yet complementary, political and social agenda to those of the European Western powers, especially England, during this era, the analytical lens must be refocused to assess the influence of the British Invasion on American youth

culture. The features in *16 Magazine* that highlighted the fractured depictions of female celebrities and femininity in general emerge as one type of cultural production that helped to make meaning of the strategic separation of British and American interests during this era. Clear distinctions in the representations of British and American female celebrities underscore the strategic separation between the two; the British “birds” and American “sisters” who were featured in the pages of *16 Magazine* subtly represented the fractured alliance within the West, while prominently representing the fractured femininity pervasive in American girlhood.

The terminology itself that was used to describe these young women is indicative of the fractured feminine roles represented in popular culture. “Birds” suggests colorful and graceful animals sought by interested watchers, uniquely identified by their distinct plumage and audible utterances, their identifying characteristics discernable only by knowledgeable observers. Such descriptions align with the functions of the British “birds” in representations of femininity in *16 Magazine*. The British female celebrities depicted in the magazine were the focal points of “appearance” features: those that illuminated fashion trends, beauty tips, and other superficial ways in which a girl could lure a boy or signify her style and interests. In addition, these celebrity “birds” deciphered British lingo, identified regional dialects, and explained in simplistic terms the youth revolution occurring in England during this era. *16 Magazine*’s representations of British women during this period focused on those who were married to or closely linked romantically with prominent musicians; rare were the features that included

single adult women. When single British women were represented, their behavior was identified as “wild,” “rebellious,” or “mad,” clearly NOT the type of behavior a young American girl should want to emulate.

“Sisters” connotes female siblings, born into their specific relationships; girls inextricably linked to their familial peers, with traits and idiosyncrasies determined by genetic codes; supportive female models who display behaviors to be emulated; and confidants who, by virtue of their generational position in the family, are subject to the authority of their parents. These descriptions take on additional significance if we consider the representation of the nuclear family during the Cold War era as a metaphor for a society steeled against subversive influence. Again, these descriptions aligned with the functions of American “secret sisters” as representations of femininity in *16 Magazine*. The American celebrity “sisters” featured in the magazine were the focal points of “behavior” content, articles which reinforced “appropriate” actions, thoughts, and relationships. Advice columns, “day in the life” pictorials, and personal exhortations about boys and life goals were common among these features.

In essence, while the “birds” provided advice on superficial characteristics that could be “tried on” and put on display, the “sisters” gave instruction on how to properly behave and mature into a responsible American woman. In the rare instances when American stars were featured in beauty columns, two trends emerged: they were described as beautiful “on the inside,” due to their socially normative behaviors; and/or they endorsed specific brands of beauty products, reinforcing the importance of being a responsible consumer. Incidentally, female

celebrities who were married, whether British or American, were presented first and foremost as wives and mothers, exemplified in features such as “Maureen: My Life at Home with Ringo,” “The Truth about the Beatles’ Girls! How Did Pattie Nab George?,” “Meet Marianne Faithfull – and Her Husband, John,” and “Cynthia [Lennon]’s Secret: How to Hold Your Guy.” This trend underscores that, while fractures may have existed in the British-American alliance, behaviors that aligned with American social norms, specifically pursuit of marriage and family, were reinforced regardless of national origin.

It is evident that Gloria Stavers directed the content of *16 Magazine* during her tenure as editor; by the time of the magazine’s peak popularity in the mid-1960s, Stavers had perfected her formula. Unlike competing magazines, Stavers ensured that *16 Magazine* never published a negative word about the girlfriends and wives of popular stars. Instead of presenting them as competition for her readers, Stavers incorporated them to create perceived peer relationships within the “Dreamsville” she offered to readers – and utilized them as models and columnists in a savvy move to encourage her readers in their development as consumers. The women who dated and married members of The Beatles headlined the majority of these features. “How You Can Get the ‘Cynthia Lennon Look’” included instructions for how a girl could emulate John Lennon’s wife, yet retain her own individuality:

The radiant beauty of Cynthia Lennon is not overwhelming – it is quietly breathtaking. The glowing attractiveness of John Lennon’s popular wife is not flashy or phoney – it is calmly captivating. At a time when false eyelashes, tons of “shadings,” every color of eye-shadow and layers of white make-up are all the rage – Cynthia

Lennon's beauty emerges as a great and exciting relief in a parade of monotonous "look alikes."³⁷

Among the most prominently featured "birds" in *16 Magazine* were the wives and girlfriends of The Beatles, specifically Jane Asher, Cynthia Lennon, and Maureen Cox. Models Jill Stuart and Samantha Juste, the wives of, respectively, Chad and Jeremy's Chad Stuart and The Monkees' Micky Dolenz, also were featured in regular columns. However, none of these women truly rivaled the popularity of Pattie Boyd among *16 Magazine's* readers. Boyd, a top British model who, as George Harrison's girlfriend (and wife, from 1966 to 1974), was one of the darlings of "Swinging London" and gave *16 Magazine's* readers inside information on how to look like a hip "dolly bird." Boyd was the credited author of two columns in *16 Magazine*, "Pattie Boyd's Letter from London" and "Pattie Boyd's 'Beauty Box,'" and was also one of the few female celebrities to earn a color pinup in the magazine during this era.

Boyd's columns are examples of how Gloria Stavers cultivated the intersections between American girl culture and British popular culture through images and perceptions of feminine beauty, while encouraging her readers to become active consumers. In the 1965 three-part series "Pattie Boyd's 'Beauty Box,'" Boyd included step-by-step instructions on how to get her "look," including eye make-up, hair styling, and face make-up. Interspersed in these columns were references to London slang and Mod fashion trends, such as the "pale look" and the importance of heavy black eyeliner. Beyond beauty advice, Boyd

encouraged readers to purchase products and experiment with their style, and instructed readers on how to gain access to the following month's column.

Since a girl's "shining glory" truly is her hair, I think it is very important to pay extra special attention to your "Barnet" – that's London slang for hair-do... You will have to experiment with various shampoos to find the one that is right for you... If you have trouble with this hair style, don't despair. Please keep trying and soon you will learn how to do what is exactly right for you and your hair type... Next month, in the November issue of *16 Magazine*, I am going to tell you my basic "face make-up" secrets. How to get that "pale look" and how to do your lips so that they look natural, but have a pretty sheen. Be sure to get the November issue of *16*. It will be on sale September 21st.³⁸

Just in case readers of the November issue missed Pattie's previous advice, she provided explicit instructions on how to retrieve it:

In the past two issues of *16*, I have tipped you dollies on how to apply eye make-up and how to do your hair – if it is long. If you missed either of those two issues (September and October), turn to Page 65 and you will find out how you can order them through *16 Magazine*.³⁹

While the British girlfriends and wives of "fave raves" were profiled for their beauty and style, romantically unattached British women were represented quite differently – as Others who were NOT proper behavioral role models in any way. Singer Dusty Springfield was one such example of a behavioral Other, clearly not in alignment with "appropriate" normative behavior for American girls. In "Dusty is a Raver! She's Mad, Mad, Mad," a discussion of Springfield's over-the-top makeup application is followed by a detailed description of her "bad temper," "tantrums," "practical jokes," and "crazy parties." The tone of the article is cautionary, but not outright critical; it concludes, "Don't misinterpret or get us wrong. Dusty is a great gal – she just happens to be a raver!"⁴⁰ Whether

Springfield's homosexuality influenced this depiction is unknown; however, as a "crazy" unmarried partier, she definitely was not elevated to the status of a role model.

As actress Hayley Mills matured into adulthood, she was represented similarly, but more subtly. Articles discussing "studio rivalries" with fellow actresses mentioned her difficult attitude and behavior, while her affair with a much older married producer was addressed in *La Gatita* gossip columns. A description of her family life noted that Mills was "a wit and a rare devil, and can be a rebel... the press-painted picture of the homey-happy-sweetsy Mills' household is falling by the wayside – and is being replaced by a frank, open, sometime troubled... family picture." Regarding her appearance, "rebel Hayley has also managed to wiggle her way into some very grown-up outfits... and to turn up for photographic affairs looking like anything *but* mamma's little darling!"⁴¹ Characterized as a "Falling Star," she was described as "sick and tired of 'kid' roles and hopes never to have to do another! ... thousands upon thousands of Hayley's teenage fans were confused and bewildered by her intensely dramatic and controversial role... [and] went away from the movie wondering what had happened to the Hayley they used to know."⁴² In "Hayley: Her Wild New Life!", Mills is described as "shak[ing] off that nice-girl image," while sitting in a Kensington pub. In a description of her latest acting role, the article states that Mills will portray "a complicated, retarded girl." Mills responds, "That wasn't really too hard to do!"⁴³ The rhetoric used to describe both Springfield and Mills

highlighted their erratic behavior, “rebellious” attitudes, and poor decision-making that caused turmoil for those around them.

Overall, British “Birds” were relegated to the status of Mod “Others,” differentiated from American women by their make-up, fashion, language, and, in some cases, their behavior. Nonetheless, their incorporation as visual icons in the pages of *16 Magazine* reveals their utility as representations of the attractive romantic partners sought by future husbands, as well as consumers who cannily utilized beauty products and trendy fashions to exhibit their personal styles. The emphasis placed on their beauty and appearances aligned them as “image models” perhaps, but certainly not role models to be emulated by American girls.

In contrast, American “Secret Sisters” were young women who were famous for their own careers in entertainment industries, usually as singers and/or actresses. However, their *careers* were not emphasized in *16 Magazine*. They were famous due to their Top 40 songs, television appearances, or film roles, but their careers had little to do with their functions in the magazine. In the early 1960s, Connie Francis and Lesley Gore were featured as “Secret Sisters” whose advice columns revealed the keys to gaining popularity, dealing with parents, and expressing interest in a boy. Typical concerns addressed by Connie Francis included: “My girlfriend and I have a problem concerning a boy who doesn’t even know we exist”; “I have a problem with my older sister”; “When my father comes home and see me talking with boys in front of our house, he gets furious”; and “I can’t make any friends.” Connie’s advice was consistent - be nice, polite, and respect your parents. Among her responses to these queries

were, “Be warm and friendly”; “Talk to your parents”; “You can’t tell your dad what to do!”; “Act mature and sensible”; “Find some Beatles, DC5 and Stones lovers, and they’ll *adore* you.”⁴⁴ Francis and Gore did not provide advice on social etiquette and relationships because they were singers, but because they were well-liked celebrities who were familiar to readers *and* considered respectable by their parents. Their careers were secondary to their roles as “sisters” in the imagined community of American girlhood.

As trends changed and stars’ popularity with readers faded, new “sisters” emerged to guide girls with their advice and words of experienced wisdom. Just as Bandstand dancer Justine Carrelli introduced Connie Francis as a new “sister” to *16 Magazine*’s readers in “That Cool Cutie” in 1960, Francis introduced Lesley Gore as a trusted “sister” in May 1964, in “Lesley & Connie Talk About BOYS! BOYS! BOYS!” In features such as “How You Can Be Patty Duke’s Best Friend,” “Shelley [Fabares]’s Wedding Day,” and Lesley Gore’s advice features, “You Don’t Have to Be Left Out!” and “How to Make the Most of Yourself,” American “sisters” provided advice on how to embrace and exhibit stereotypically feminine traits and behaviors to become socially successful. However, no “sister” received more coverage in *16 Magazine* than Cher, both as an individual and as the wife and singing partner of Sonny Bono. Fortunately for the girls who didn’t have Pattie Boyd’s fair, blonde looks, or didn’t find the British style appealing, “The Cher Look” offered an alternative appearance to emulate:

About the only thing in common Cher (of Sonny and Cher) has with our blonde English friend, Pattie Boyd... is long hair. Yet Cher has emerged from the sunshine and smog of Hollywood as the strongest new trend-setter in the world. The “English look” – which

is still very much “in” – will soon be feeling the heat of the rising sun of the “Cher look.” Though the “Cher look” sports long hair, lots of eyes and no lipstick, it is somehow more vital, more challenging and more “soulful” than the “English look.”

When the mail for info on how Cher achieves this fascinating “aura” began to pour into *16*, it was *immediately* time to get Cher herself to step forward and tell you *16*-ers the secret of her unusual beauty and how *you* can achieve it. So here it is, just as Cher herself dictated it.⁴⁵

While Cher was one of the few American women incorporated into a beauty-oriented feature in *16 Magazine* during the British Invasion era, the article highlighted characteristics that were not solely appearance-oriented. Cher’s “soulful” appearance and “fascinating ‘aura’” were vague but appealing facets of the American star, facets which never were even hinted at in the superficial depictions of British “birds.” The implied depth of character and intrigue that Cher embodied insinuated that there was *more* to her than just her appearance – and soon thereafter, Cher became the predominant advice columnist in *16 Magazine*. Cher was the credited author of an advice column for nearly three years; many of those columns also featured her husband Sonny as a co-author who fielded questions about what boys found appealing and how girls should act around boys, as well as questions from boys about how to act around girls. Gloria Stavers described Cher’s appeal for *16 Magazine*’s readers in a 1969 *Rolling Stone* profile: “Our readers weren’t jealous or envious of her. Instead, they felt like they could talk to her – and that she would understand them.”⁴⁶ The significance of this is not lost; as one of the few prominently married female celebrities of the era, Cher could expound on the roles and responsibilities of being a wife and mother with credibility and examples from her own experiences.

In the first installment of her monthly column, Cher addressed her readers directly: “I – Cher – promise you that I will do all I can to help and guide you in every way possible in your day-to-day life. I’ve just emerged from my early teens and I know what unhappiness and suffering a young girl often goes through – and all too often has to go through alone. Well, you aren’t alone anymore. I am here. You can count on me and I will not fail you.”⁴⁷

Another example of American beauty embodying more than just appearance incorporated singer Michelle Phillips, famously married to John Phillips, one of her singing partners in The Mamas and The Papas. In 1966’s “Michelle: All American Beauty,” the young woman’s inherent traits and behaviors were the focus of the article. The feature’s emphasis is clear: appearance is secondary to behavior. “The ‘Michelle look’ is not just a *look*; it is a *way*, too. A way of walking, speaking, listening, seeing and living.” In proper instructional form, the passage continued, “But let’s take it all one thing at a time so that you can absorb it, and be able to put your knowledge to work later.” After a brief account of Michelle’s beauty routine, the article refocused on how “Michelle went about trying to improve her ‘life.’ She found that if she would stop thinking of herself and her problems, and really listen to others and take an interest in them – that those “others” soon became truly interested in *her*, and wanted *her* for a friend. It was really quite simple: one just had to quit being selfish, dwelling on oneself and being introverted.”⁴⁸

These examples of the beauty and fashion advice featured in *16 Magazine* highlight the patterns evident in the presentation of female celebrities

in the magazine. The columns, purportedly written by prominent female stars (but likely written by Gloria Stavers instead), included suggestions for how girls could participate in the latest trends and styles while still incorporating their own sense of individuality. By styling their hair or applying make-up like a Beatle's wife did, girls could incorporate signifiers to represent themselves as part of the "in crowd." The columns also reveal how Gloria Stavers subtly incorporated consumer conditioning into the editorial content of *16 Magazine*. Most of these columns were featured directly opposite advertisements for "16's Popularity & Beauty Book." Beyond the implication that readers must purchase previous or future issues of *16 Magazine*, or *16 Magazine's* helpful pamphlets, in order to most fully learn how to emulate their fashion role models, these beauty columns included advice on products to purchase to "complete the look." In fact, Cher's column actually mentioned products by name, which was unusual for *16*

Magazine:

For my lips, I use a great new lipstick I just found. It is called Coty *Moonlight Frost*, and you can get it at the five and dime store (hope Coty is grateful for this free plug!). If this particular lipstick doesn't look right on you, then – once again – you will have to shop around until you come up with just the thing for your lips... As for my hair... I always use Head & Shoulders shampoo (*now we should get a nice thanks from Proctor & Gamble!*).⁴⁹

Specifying the types and preferred brands of beauty products reinforced the importance of a girl's role as a responsible and savvy consumer. Similarly, in "Sally Field Reveals 'How to Get That Gidget Look,'" Field endorses Wella's Kolestrol conditioner, and suggests that girls experiment with a "trial-and-error" method of determining the best shades of makeup for their complexions,

reinforcing the ideal consumer practice of buying beauty products – the more the better! - to enhance their femininity.

Fave Raves as Commodities

While Gloria Stavers's use of beauty and fashion features to cultivate consumers was quite apparent and typical of teen magazines, her use of stars themselves as commodities was less obvious, yet much more influential. Throughout her tenure as editor of *16 Magazine*, Gloria Stavers treated popular stars as commodities to be possessed by fans. This tactic became quite evident after the emergence of The Beatles as international stars and *16 Magazine's* "fave raves." As The Beatles' popularity grew, so did the circulation of *16 Magazine*. Stavers gained readers' trust and confidence through her direct approach of communicating with them in her letters and columns, *16 Magazine's* positive depictions of female celebrities, and consistent reinforcement of the ways in which her readers could become unique and popular individuals. The pages of *16 Magazine* provided a space for girls to express their concerns and confusions about adolescence, as well as to create fantasies about their favorite stars – the "Dreamsville" that Stavers envisioned for her readers to use as an imagined environment in which they could contemplated and negotiate their own femininity. Such fantasies were the basis of most of the feature content in the magazine and, through them, Stavers introduced and perpetuated the beliefs that pop stars were accessible and relationships with them attainable.

16 Magazine published a multitude of articles that detailed what appealed to pop stars, from their favorite colors and foods to what they looked for in a girl. These articles featured titles such as “Peter and Gordon Reveal Their Hates & Loves!”; “My True Life Story’ by Raider Mark Lindsay”; “Chad & Jeremy Answer 80 Very Snoopy Questions”; and “50 Things You NEVER Knew About The Beatles.” *16 Magazine* also featured a monthly “home address” page, which listed the best addresses for contacting the top teen idols. For example, the April 1965 issue included Mr. & Mrs. John Lennon, George Harrison, singer/actress Ann-Margret, Rolling Stone Brian Jones, and even Prince Charles, who became a minor “fave rave” by virtue of being young, English, and famous. If that was not enough, the pages opposite these “home address” pages always featured an advertisement for “16’s All-Star Home Address Book,” a comprehensive collection of contact information for the magazine’s most popular celebrities. These types of features provided readers with additional information and accessibility to their favorite stars, allowing fans to consider themselves insiders privy to the most intimate details of these celebrities’ lives.

Aside from The Beatles and Rolling Stones, numerous other British artists gained popularity as part of the British Invasion and were featured as “fave raves” in *16 Magazine*. The Dave Clark 5, Herman’s Hermits, Peter & Gordon, and Chad & Jeremy all received considerable promotion in the pages of *16 Magazine*, especially as they were willing to offer Gloria Stavers exclusive interviews and photos. According to Peter Noone, lead singer of Herman’s Hermits,

People who were big in those days were the people whose pictures were in *16 Magazine*... It was the only way kids could find out what they wanted to know – who Paul McCartney and Herman loved... Gloria was fiercely competitive. We always gave *16* the first shot at everything, mostly out of loyalty, but partly because we feared her reaction if we didn't. She would get furious with me if I did something for *Tiger Beat*, I mean physically furious... Besides, *16* seemed classier than any others. It didn't have any advertisements in it.⁵⁰

Noone also explained how Stavers depicted the stars in her magazine, and pinpointed the crucial factor in Stavers's motivations:

We showed up in *16* in all sorts of intimate photos, but never with girlfriends, or groupies that were hanging around. Gloria wouldn't take that kind of picture because she believed that every girl, every reader, "owned" me. That girl, that *16* reader, was somebody to be protected. You couldn't hurt her... that's what Gloria taught us. She was the protectress of this little flock of children... *16* always respected the fans, and so did I.⁵¹

It is evident that the stars themselves realized how Stavers was using the magazine to sell them, as well as their music, and they cooperated, out of concerns for their profits as well as the respect they had for Stavers. *Rolling Stone* described how *16 Magazine* "ma[d]e objects out of people" and how many young women, especially groupies, considered pop stars "not as people but as commodities."⁵² Stavers provided a more complex description of the audience's "ownership" of pop stars: "In our popular society... she might see a TV show or a movie or hear a record, and she just latches on to someone or a group with a feeling of *That's mine!* ... In front of her, there's a photograph of this lovely person, and she takes total charge: it's *hers*."⁵³

Another of Gloria Stavers's most accommodating and loyal stars of this era was Mark Lindsay, lead singer of Paul Revere and the Raiders. Lindsay was

legitimately single, handsome, talented, and incredibly photogenic. He developed a close friendship with Stavers and revealed how she approached *16 Magazine*: “She was like a modern day Mother Goose giving adolescents something to believe in, to make the transition into adulthood a little easier, a little harmless fantasy.”⁵⁴ Lindsay also noted, “She kind of took me under her wing in a way and said ‘Let’s amplify your stage persona.’ She got me a tailor and hired him to make me outfits for off stage that would portray the image a little further... to become more the swash buckling hero type that would help her sell magazines. We kind of made a deal. She said ‘I’ll increase your notoriety and help your career if you help sell magazines for me’ and that was it.”⁵⁵ Mark Lindsay and the other Raiders were eminently popular with the readers of *16 Magazine*, and were the most featured American act in the magazine in 1965 and 1966. The Raiders were stars of Dick Clark’s popular youth-oriented television show *Where the Action Is*, which aired on ABC every weekday afternoon from 1965 to 1967; the Raiders also earned four Top 10 albums and eight Top 25 songs on the Billboard charts in the same period.⁵⁶

Mark Lindsay epitomized how Gloria Stavers utilized pop stars in “Dreamsville” to extend romantic fantasies and cultivate a sense of “ownership” of the stars among readers. He was featured in numerous pictorials, including “At Home with Mark Lindsay,” “Behind the Closed Door with Mark Lindsay,” and “Come Home with Me.” These spreads, exclusively photographed by Stavers herself, take readers through Lindsay’s home and reveal his private environment – where the reader could imagine herself accompanying him. In the contest

feature “Win a ‘Personal Record’ from Mark Lindsay!” Lindsay writes in a very personal style, directly addressing the reader/consumer:

Yes, it’s me, Mark Lindsay. And I have what I hope will be a very wonderful surprise for you – whether you are the “little girl in the fourth row”... or that “unknown girl” I haven’t met yet, but keep searching for... On one side of the record, I will talk to you – call your name – tell you what I think of you, and then tell you a few things about myself. On the other side of the record, I will sing a song and it will be dedicated to you – *only you* – with your name in it. It will be your song and my song – in other words, *our* song... Here is *all* you have to do: Sit down and write me a letter - it doesn’t have to be a long one, for *sincerity* is what matters most of all. Tell me about yourself... When I have read all of your letters *carefully*, I will select one – and that one (who I hope will be *you*) will be the winner...⁵⁷

One of *16 Magazine*’s most direct efforts to cultivate girls as consumers of the artist-commodity was in its contests, exemplified by “Win Mark Lindsay’s Ponytail!” In this contest, Mark Lindsay again was the object of consumer desires, a commodity to be owned by a reader, in a very personal way. Readers competed to win an actual piece of Mark Lindsay, specifically his hair. Lindsay’s hair was one of his best-known features; he sported a ponytail that trailed halfway down his back. The contest would supply the winner with some of Lindsay’s hair:

You saw it with your own eyes on *Where the Action Is* (if you were lucky) and now it can belong to you! What? Mark Lindsay’s ponytail, that’s what! ... Teenagers all over America let out a simultaneous shriek (and some fainted dead away), but no one was the worse for it as Mark has gangs of hair and there was plenty enough to... still leave that noble “queue” of his intact... [the] piece was flown straight to *16 Magazine* by Mark himself – along with a groovy little note from him verifying that this lock of hair indeed is legitimately from his very own ponytail!⁵⁸

As with most *16 Magazine* contests, winners would be selected by a “blindfolded Gloria Stavers,” the objective facilitator of girls’ fantasies in the pages of *16 Magazine*.⁵⁹

Dino, Desi, and Billy were among *16 Magazine*’s “fave raves” in the mid-1960s, despite having minimal Top 40 chart success. Dean Paul “Dino” Martin was the son of Dean Martin; Desi Arnaz, Jr., was the son of Lucille Ball and Desi Arnaz; and Billy Hinsche was the son of a prominent Hollywood real estate agent, as well as the brother-in-law of Beach Boy Carl Wilson. Their popularity mostly came from their television appearances and magazine features; as the teenage sons of prominent Hollywood celebrities, they needed little assistance in gaining publicity. However, they were cordial and willing participants in some of Gloria Stavers’s typical features designed to close the gap between readers and their idols, as well as cultivate consumer desires to “collect the stars.” One of the most frequent and enduring features of *16 Magazine* was the contest to “win a date” with a star. Dino, Desi and Billy were especially popular in this feature, likely because they were approximately the same age as the majority of *16 Magazine*’s readers. The fantasy of a romance with these stars could come true, or so their fans believed – especially when subsequent issues featured photos of the “lucky winner” shopping, dining, dancing, and having fun with the stars. The August 1966 issue featured the opportunity to “Win a Day in Hollywood with Dino, Desi & Billy!” The contest winner would “have lunch with them, visit their homes, visit their families and friends, go on a shopping spree,” as well as tour Sunset Strip and spend the evening at a night club with the boys. The only

requirements for this contest were a one-page written letter and, in an unusual tactic for *16 Magazine*, a recent photograph. Then, “All letters will be judged by Gloria Stavers, *16*’s editor. She will select the *one* letter which in her judgment is the best – the most heartfelt and most sincere.”⁶⁰

Across the range of features in *16 Magazine* – whether beauty tutorials, advice columns, detailed celebrity profiles, day-in-the-life pictorials, or a “fave rave” direct address to the singular “you” the reader – consistent themes emerged and preferred characteristics identified. “Heartfelt” and “sincere” girls with “depth” and “soul” were sketched out, figuratively, as most appealing to the boys and most trusted by the girls. When presented with advice on how to imitate a celebrity’s style or appearance, girls were implored to retain and accentuate their own unique “individuality.” In essence, while it might seem appealing to “fit in,” a girl should never lose herself to please others. Adhering to social norms, especially during this era of sociopolitical conflict and challenges, was encouraged, but the priority was that the girl didn’t lose her inherent beauty and character – her “self” – along the way. As Lesley Gore advised in November 1964, “When you present yourself to others for their approval and acceptance, you must give them something worth wanting to accept.”⁶¹

Gloria Stavers used the features in *16 Magazine* to assist girls in comprehending what seemed incomprehensible to them: how to groom themselves into “appropriate” feminine individuals with wide-ranging emotions, while still adhering to the fractured yet normative roles of sisterly confidant, responsible consumer, and “future mother of America.” All of these roles required

negotiation and appropriate visible identifiers dependent upon the specific situation in which a girl found herself at any given time. While a girl's personal style and taste might encourage her to temporarily experiment with various appearances, utilizing "kicky-fab fashions" or "Mod make-up," her true character would be revealed in her behavior. Thus, while British birds could suggest visual signifiers that a girl may favor, responsible girls who sought to participate in, and be accepted by, American society were encouraged to emulate the behaviors of their American "sisters." In short, conforming to social expectations and pursuing a path towards marriage would assure a girl of embodying the true "All-American Beauty" of married Michelle Phillips. As Cold War era politics and social challenges surrounded them in their daily lives, the "Dreamsville" of *16 Magazine* allowed girls to "try on" different fantasies and determine if those hopes and dreams were compatible with their specific realities. But as the 1960s continued on, greater challenges to the norms – highlighted very boldly and attractively in "anti-Establishment" packages – would make for increasingly confusing territories to investigate for the typical *16 Magazine* readers. Fortunately, Gloria Stavers found successful ways to assist girls in navigating these challenging concepts, and she continued to utilize pop stars to mitigate the confusion – in some cases, the same pop stars who symbolized the very essence of the counterculture, as middle America perceived it. As Stavers described the haven of *16 Magazine* for its readers, "Ours is an entertainment book as opposed to a book about the record industry. It's like ice cream, in a way. It's escape. It's what you escape into that's important."⁶²

NOTES

1. Gloria Stavers, "What Is Beauty? What Is Popularity?" in *16's Popularity & Beauty Book* (New York: The Girl Friend-Boy Friend Corporation, c. 1964), 2.
2. John Burks and Jerry Hopkins, *Groupies and Other Girls* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), 95.
3. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Moya Luckett, "Girl Watchers: Patty Duke and Teen TV," in *The Revolution Wasn't Televised: Sixties Television and Social Conflict*, eds. Lynn Spigel and Michael Curtin (New York: Routledge, 1997); and Ilana Nash, *American Sweethearts: Teenage Girls in Twentieth-Century Popular Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).
4. *The Patty Duke Show*, "The Wedding Anniversary Caper," episode 28, originally aired March 18, 1964, on ABC.
5. *The Patty Duke Show*, "The Perfect Teenager," episode 26, originally aired March 4, 1964, on ABC.
6. Gloria Stavers, quoted in Burks and Hopkins, 94.
7. For theories that influenced these arguments, see Grace Palladino, *Teenagers: An American History* (New York: BasicBooks, 1996); Kelly Schrum, "'Teena Means Business': Teenage Girls' Culture and Seventeen Magazine, 1944-1950," in *Delinquents and Debutantes: Twentieth-Century American Girls' Culture*, ed. Sherrie A. Inness (New York: New York University Press, 1998); Wini Breines, *Young, White, and Miserable: Growing Up Female in the Fifties* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992); and Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004).
8. Dick Clark, quoted in Reisfeld and Fields, xiv.
9. Gloria Stavers, quoted in William Kloman, "Meet Gloria Stavers," *Saturday Evening Post Magazine*, November 4, 1967, 81.
10. Stavers, in Kloman, 81.
11. McAlister, 40.
12. McAlister, 8.

-
13. Philip Norman, *Shout! The Beatles in Their Generation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), 225.
 14. Jim Curtis, *Rock Eras: Interpretations of Music and Society, 1954-1984*, 3rd ed. (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1995), 146.
 15. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Gitlin; Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (London: Routledge, 1993); and Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (New York: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1979).
 16. Simon Frith, *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock 'n' Roll* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), 220.
 17. Jonathon Green, *All Dressed Up: The Sixties and the Counter-culture* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1998), 43.
 18. Iain Chambers, *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture* (London: McMillan Publishers, Ltd., 1985), 56.
 19. Twiggy Lawson with Penelope Dening, *Twiggy: In Black and White* (London: Simon and Schuster UK, Ltd., 1997), 38.
 20. Chambers, 78.
 21. Peter Wicke, *Rock Music: Culture, Aesthetics, and Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 76.
 22. Levy, 113.
 23. "Dusty Tells Lesley All About Mods & Rockers," *16 Magazine*, January 1965, 62-63.
 24. "Beatles' Personal Letters," *16 Magazine*, August 1965, 38.
 25. "Jill Stuart's 'Letter from London,'" *16 Magazine*, October 1965, 50.
 26. Reisfeld and Fields, 42.
 27. Reisfeld and Fields, 43.
 28. Paul McCartney, quoted in Reisfeld and Fields, 43.

-
29. Gloria Stavers, "Have the Beatles Changed?" *16 Magazine*, August 1965, 56.
 30. Danny Fields, in Reisfeld and Fields, 47.
 31. "The Rolling Stones – Has England Gone Too Far?" *16 Magazine*, August 1964, 38-39.
 32. "The Rolling Stones – They Get Away With MURDER!!" *16 Magazine*, September 1964, 46-47.
 33. "Learn 'Liddypool Scouse' The Language of the Beatles!" *16 Magazine*, April 1965, 27.
 34. Tina Williams, "My 3 Days With The Beatles," *16 Magazine*, September 1964, 12.
 35. "Jill Stuart."
 36. "Peter & Gordon's Carnaby Street Shopping Spree Giveaway!", *16 Magazine*, March 1967, 52.
 37. "How You Can Get the 'Cynthia Lennon Look,'" *16 Magazine*, February 1966, 8.
 38. "Pattie Boyd's 'Beauty Box': Hair Care Secrets," *16 Magazine*, October 1965, 44.
 39. "Pattie Boyd's 'Beauty Box': Let's Talk About Your Face," *16 Magazine*, November 1965, 46.
 40. "Dusty is a Raver! She's mad, mad, MAD... That's What She Is!" *16 Magazine*, March 1965, 52.
 41. "Patty and Hayley: is their Home-Life Happy?" *16 Magazine*, August 1964, 9.
 42. "Is Hayley a 'Falling Star'?" *16 Magazine*, October 1964, 4.
 43. "Hayley: Her Wild New Life!" *16 Magazine*, June 1966, 10.
 44. "Connie Francis Your 'Secret Sister' Wants to Help You with Your Problems!" *16 Magazine*, February 1965, 28.
 45. "The 'Cher Look,'" *16 Magazine*, November 1965, 47.
 46. Stavers, quoted in Burks and Hopkins, 96.

-
47. "Dear Cher," *16 Magazine*, Sept 1966, 26.
48. "Michelle – All-American Beauty," *16 Magazine*, August 1966, 16.
49. "The 'Cher Look,'" 47. Of course, it is possible that Stavers covertly received promotional revenue for these plugs, or perhaps Cher had promotional contracts with the companies.
50. Peter Noone, in Reisfeld and Fields, 61.
51. Peter Noone, in Reisfeld and Fields, 61-63.
52. Burks and Hopkins, 95.
53. Stavers, quoted in Burks and Hopkins, 97.
54. Mark Lindsay, in Reisfeld and Fields, 93.
55. Mark Lindsay, quoted in "Happening '10: A Conversation with Mark Lindsay." *Confessions of a Pop Culture Addict*, Interviews, Mark Lindsay. <http://popcultureaddict.com/interviews/marklindsay/> (accessed 29 December 2013)
56. Joel Whitburn, *The Billboard Book of Top 40 Hits*, 6th ed. (New York: Billboard Publications, Inc., 1996), 505; Joel Whitburn, *The Billboard Book of Top 40 Albums*, 2nd ed. (New York: Billboard Books, 1991), 220.
57. "Win a 'Personal Record' from Mark Lindsay!" *16 Magazine*, December 1966, 51.
58. "Win Mark Lindsay's Ponytail!" *16 Magazine*, November 1966, 26.
59. "Outasite Raiders – Beatles – Hermits Contest!" *16 Magazine*, November 1966, 54-55.
60. "Win a Day in Hollywood with Dino, Desi & Billy!" *16 Magazine*, August 1966, 51.
61. Lesley Gore, "You DON'T have to be LEFT OUT!" *16 Magazine*, November 1964, 16.
62. Stavers, in Burks and Hopkins, 94.

**“We’re the Young Generation and We’ve Got Something to Say”:
Emphasizing the *Establishment* in “Anti-Establishment”**

1967-1969

“There is a great kind of generosity I’ve noticed in the last three or four years that wasn’t in the early mail... There’s a great caring about others, and very few uptight, I-can’t-stand-him letters. It all started with the flower children, and it’s almost like ‘And a little child shall lead them.’ At the risk of sounding sacrilegious, it enters into a kind of Christlike goodness: really good love for all creatures.”¹ –
Gloria Stavers

The socially and politically contentious decades following World War II brought attention to American youth that previously was reserved for marginalized populations. Mainstream culture utilized the term “youth” very fluidly, referring to pre-adolescent children, teenagers, and/or college-aged adults depending on the circumstances. Generally, the term “youth” designated anyone not old enough to vote, hence perceived not mature enough to contribute autonomously to the divisive political, social, and cultural discourses of the era. Influenced by the increasingly volatile ideological and military threats of Soviet-influenced communism, American social and cultural institutions practiced a policy of domestic containment that paralleled the dominant political ideology. With echoes of the surveillance and suspicion to which immigrants and African-Americans previously (and simultaneously) were subjected, American youth in the Cold War era found themselves at the center of ideological negotiations regarding American stability, security, and democracy.

Mainstream culture manifested these negotiations in its projections and critiques of American society, and illuminated normative behaviors that would

prevent disruption of the American political agenda of democratic strength and dominance of capitalism. Allegiance to America, respect for the authority of elders, strong work ethics, responsible consumerism, and heterosexuality were among the most integral components of normative society during this era. At the core of this idealistic, conformist agenda was the stability of the family, which would instill proper gender and generational roles and behaviors while serving as a microcosm of American society and the foundation for a stable and secure American democratic future. However, a fear of corruption and subversion that could threaten the pliable minds of the young accompanied the faith placed in them to carry forth the ideals of democracy and capitalism for subsequent generations. To avoid the penetration of menacing ideologies, parents were accountable for modeling normative behaviors in the domestic sphere and conditioning their children to fulfill their patriotic duties. Meanwhile, the entertainment industries reinforced these notions of conformity in the public sphere by utilizing the media that attracted the largest youth audiences, television and radio. Television and radio compliance with normative standards, enforced by federal regulations of censorship and decency, became increasingly significant as youth spent more time among their peers without parental supervision.

Social ideologues of the Cold War era frequently perceived and conceived of youth culture as opposing or rejecting mainstream ideologies, generally because young people developed their own cultural tastes and differentiated themselves stylistically from their parents. As Blaine R. Porter, Chairman of the

Family Life Education Department at Brigham Young University noted in 1965, “such areas as education, employment, goals, values, and morality present problems of an unprecedented nature. This generation of teen-agers faces the challenge of making wise choices regarding power, money, sex, prejudice, and their role in the world. They must find a moral code that will suit their needs in the society in which they live.” Porter also stressed that “doubt, anxiety, cynicism, and indifference still permeate much of our thinking about adolescents” who faced the challenge of a future which would “revolve not around the production of goods, but around the difficulties and opportunities involved in a world of accelerating change and ever-widening choices.” He also explained that the progress of modern society had “contributed to our moral crisis. The bomb, the computer, the vending machine, the oral contraceptives have challenged our traditional sense of responsibility...”² The instant gratification that technology had made available created new challenges and concerns regarding how to train teenagers in making practical and well-founded decisions regarding their futures, and ultimately the future of America. These concerns were exacerbated as youth peer culture coalesced around popular culture, regardless of whether or not young people actively rejected the norms of their parents.

Adolescents’ stratification from the homogenous norms generated concern that the entertainers whom they idolized and with whom they identified could subvert the stability sought by mainstream society. As non-conformist entertainers such as Elvis Presley and James Dean became profitable stars whom young people idolized and emulated, the television and radio industries

devised ways in which they could continue to promulgate mainstream ideologies while appealing to teenage tastes and styles. The visual and aural signifiers of youth culture were adapted to the staid conventions of television and radio, initially with great success. These adaptations by industry producers in collusion with dominant social and political ideologies are examples of hegemonic co-option. Todd Gitlin described this process as when “major social conflicts are transported into the cultural system, where the hegemonic process frames them, form and content both, into compatibility with dominant systems of meaning.”³ To be clear, while cultural producers may have attempted to co-opt the ideologies of young audiences, they were more successful at co-opting the signifiers of youth culture. The dispersion of diverse ideologies and signifiers among young people, as well as the rapid pace at which they changed, made this hegemonic process difficult to achieve with any legitimacy for youth culture. Nonetheless, popular media continuously attempted this process to align youth interests with the dominant ideologies of the era; their attempts at co-option intensified after youth culture intentionally shifted its pervasive ideology more to the importance of self-expression among peers rather than conformist acceptance by authorities.

Before this shift occurred, the television and radio industries reflected and reinforced dominant discourses of domestic containment and rigid gender and generational roles and behaviors while they incorporated trends and styles that appealed to the financially lucrative youth demographic. Popular family situation comedies highlighted their teenage characters and brought pop music into their

storylines, turning Ricky Nelson, Shelly Fabares, Paul Petersen, and Patty Duke into television stars and Top 40 hitmakers. The radio industry introduced the Top 40 format, ensuring that the most legitimately requested and most frequently purchased records would receive the most airplay. Popular songs from African-American artists, such as Chuck Berry, Little Richard, and Fats Domino, which originally featured risqué blues and jazz inflections were “white-washed” and covered by mainstream white artists, such as Pat Boone and Ricky Nelson. In addition, producers cultivated teen idols such as Fabian and Bobby Rydell rather than support artists who could potentially undermine normative ideologies as Elvis Presley previously had done.⁴

While network television did not include African-American characters frequently in their scripted programs, youth-oriented television shows did feature African-American artists fairly consistently. *American Bandstand*, *Where the Action Is*, *Shindig*, and *Hullabaloo* featured many blues, soul, and pop stars, and Ed Sullivan famously promoted and provided exposure for many black performers on his show. Sullivan caused a stir when he first featured Nat “King” Cole in the mid-‘50s, but Cole ultimately appeared thirteen times on *The Ed Sullivan Show*. Sullivan incorporated black artists frequently into his milieu of American entertainment, and soon Johnny Mathis, Cab Calloway, Louis Armstrong, Jackie Wilson, Sammy Davis, Jr., and Eartha Kitt were as popular with Sullivan viewers as Steve Lawrence, Bobby Darin, Tony Bennett, Robert Goulet, and Lucille Ball.⁵

The most successful examples of the industry's synthesis of normative ideologies with pop music were the Brill Building productions of the 1960s. The Brill Building housed contracted producers and songwriters who crafted incredibly popular formulaic songs, generally involving themes of romantic heterosexual relationships and normative gender behaviors with music that appealed to young audiences. The Brill Building companies employed a number of influential writers and producers, including Burt Bacharach and Hal David, Neil Sedaka, Neil Diamond, and Phil Spector, but the songwriters who produced the most hits were two married couples, Gerry Goffin & Carole King and Barry Mann & Cynthia Weil. Their experiences as young lovers struggling to negotiate society's expectations with their own aspirations inspired many of their early songs, including "Will You Love Me Tomorrow," "Take Good Care of My Baby," "I Love How You Love Me," "Up on the Roof," "On Broadway," "One Fine Day," and "You've Lost That Lovin' Feeling."⁶

The mainstream conventions directed at young audiences were most tangible in youth-oriented television programs that integrated popular music and teenage stars outside of the narrative conventions of sitcoms. *Shindig*, *Hullabaloo*, *American Bandstand*, and numerous local and national variety shows showed the latest bands with the top songs, along with dancers and hosts that appealed to young audiences. The producers of *The Ed Sullivan Show*, the most mainstream and popular of television's variety shows, transitioned the show into a showcase for artists with youth appeal, juxtaposing them with middle-of-the-road entertainment for adult audiences. This approach, utilized throughout the

series' run from 1948 to 1971, indicated the television and music industries' attempts to negotiate generational differences in taste and style, while reinforcing conventional ideologies. Ed Sullivan, "the unofficial Minister of Culture in America," introduced Elvis Presley to American viewing audiences with unprecedented ratings success in the late 1950s, and he replicated that success when he introduced The Beatles in 1964.⁷ Sullivan served as an authoritarian moderator for negotiations between youth and mainstream culture, presenting artists who appealed to and endorsed a distinct youth culture while ordaining their acceptability for adult audiences. Steve Allen, Milton Berle, Jack Benny, and other hosts gradually included pop musicians as featured acts on their shows as well, following the precedent set by Sullivan. By the mid-1960s, Sullivan regularly featured Motown acts, such as The Temptations, The Four Tops, The Supremes, and Marvin Gaye; by the late 1960s, counterculture icons such as Jefferson Airplane, The Doors, Janis Joplin, Richie Havens, and Tina Turner were among Sullivan's featured guests.

As The Beatles and their British Invasion brethren penetrated American culture, they violated several of the dominant American ideologies of the era while signaling the shift in youth culture to self-expression and peer acceptance. Early critics perceived them as outsiders who threatened normative American society with their unconventional appearances, love of early risqué rock and roll, and, most significantly, the sexual aggression they brought out in their young female fans. Shrieking girls who professed their love for these stars caused alarm for social critics, who believed the release of emotion was driven not by

adolescent urges or angst but by subversive characteristics of the artists themselves. As British musicians dominated the American Top 40 charts, cultural producers co-opted and reconfigured these foreign influences in attempts to reassert American cultural dominance among the nation's youth. On *The Ed Sullivan Show* throughout the 1960s, Sullivan personally endorsed British musicians and undermined the oppositional influence they might have had on mainstream culture. Sullivan practiced a similar tactic when anti-Establishment rock music became popular in the late 1960s; his inclusion of a wide variety of Motown and San Francisco-based musicians announced to Middle America that these artists did not carry the potentially subversive threats against youth that social critics believed they did.⁸

The British Invasion also introduced generational political and social critiques of middle-class conformity that fueled the Mod movement in England. Non-conformist blues and folk singers previously produced such critiques in America, and Bob Dylan was often viewed as the contemporary spokesman of non-conformist youth ideology. Although their influences and legacies were established firmly, none of these earlier artists received much mainstream airplay nor experienced any significant Top 40 chart success. However, as popular songs from British musicians, including The Rolling Stones' "(I Can't Get No) Satisfaction" and "Mother's Little Helper," The Kinks' "A Well-Respected Man" and "Dedicated Follower of Fashion," The Beatles' "Paperback Writer," and The Who's "My Generation" became Top 40 hits, they revealed critiques of their parents' and less-enlightened generational peers' empty and hypocritical

lifestyles.⁹ Mid-1960s American youth culture embraced these sentiments and popular musicians produced their own critiques of mainstream monotony and generational tensions, including Sonny and Cher's "The Beat Goes On," Simon and Garfunkel's "Mrs. Robinson," and The Vogues' "Five O'Clock World." Fractures within youth culture emerged as well, as mainstream youth increasingly became dissatisfied with their more radical peers who brought intense condescension from social critics. The Mann & Weil-penned "Kicks," the first popular anti-drug anthem, became a hit for Paul Revere and the Raiders, a band indicative of a pro-American trend in the music industry.

The Monkees Reclaim American Dominance

As music industry producers realized that the popularity of British artists threatened their profits, they retaliated with a variety of approaches. Patriotically named bands, such as Paul Revere and the Raiders, The Five Americans, Jay and the Americans, and The American Breed hit the charts, but the most popular early responses to the British Invasion were Motown soul and folk rock, authentic American music styles that had served as early influences to British artists. Not coincidentally, Motown and folk rock artists provided a visual and aural tangibility to the social movements that were fracturing American society, reflecting and influencing the tensions in these ideological battles. Within these genres, young audiences favored legitimate, authentic songwriters rather than the industry-promoted artists; for example, while Peter, Paul & Mary, the Kingston Trio, and The Limelickers were the most commercially profitable folk artists favored by

mainstream culture, Bob Dylan's songs more intensely resonated within youth culture. By the time artists such as The Byrds, The Turtles, and Cher saw mainstream Top 40 chart success covering Bob Dylan's songs, the American response to the British Invasion was in full swing.

Meanwhile, television producers again attempted to mediate generational tensions by co-opting identifiers and codifying them as innocuous trends within the context of the television comedy *The Monkees*. However, this approach brought even more tension to the cultural negotiations between mainstream society and youth culture as the disjunction between youth culture and conformist society became more visible when the characters in this comedy walked a fine line between art and reality. Originally cast as actors *playing* musicians, The Monkees and the artistic autonomy they sought as legitimate musicians highlighted the very tensions that their producers attempted to alleviate. The Monkees, as television characters, individually represented a variety of characteristics and influences in American youth culture; they were comprised of Davy, the romantic British crooner; Micky, the easy-going rocker; Peter, the silly popster; and Mike, the stoic folkie. However, when The Monkees, as musicians, rejected their producers' formulaic pop songs and session musicians and began to write and perform their own songs, their careers became a microcosm of the generational tensions that contextualized them.

Initially, The Monkees and their television show were conceived and presented to network affiliates and consumers as a "safe" alternative for preteen audiences. Though they lived in a beach house on the Pacific shore and looked

like potentially subversive young men with long hair and non-conventional clothing, their dialogue and song lyrics were *scripted*. They were actors portraying a down-on-their-luck pop band, contextualized by inane comedic situations that were more akin to Saturday morning cartoons than rebellious youths on the evening news. They looked different, sounded different, and acted different than the average young person, similar to California anti-Establishment types – but their differences were highlighted as *comedic*. Any resistance to authority or challenge to social convention depicted by The Monkees was played for laughs because they were “long-haired weirdos” who did not fit in to broader society. When NBC presented *The Monkees* to their network affiliates during the summer of 1966, none other than Dick Clark introduced them to the market representatives. Despite his affiliation with ABC, one of NBC’s primary competitors, Clark supported The Monkees because he believed they were safe for American youth – and beneficial for the American music industry, which still was attempting to regain its footing amid the British Invasion. Clark heavily favored and promoted American artists on *American Bandstand* and *Where the Action Is*, the youth-oriented television shows he produced and hosted on ABC, and he saw great potential for chart success – and a return to American dominance on the radio and in record sales – in The Monkees. Despite the endorsement from Clark, several large-market affiliate representatives were so outraged by the television show that they refused to air it on their local stations, undermining the series’ national ratings.¹⁰

When *The Monkees* debuted on NBC in September 1966 and Colgems Records simultaneously released their first album, the band immediately announced in their theme song “we’re just trying to be friendly, come and watch us sing and play, we’re the young generation, and we’ve got something to say.”¹¹ Indeed, they had plenty to say, as their first chart-topping hit, “Last Train to Clarksville,” told the story of a soldier waiting for his girlfriend to arrive before his draft deployment, while lamenting, “I don’t know if I’m ever coming home.”¹² Both songs were written by Tommy Boyce and Bobby Hart, a West Coast songwriting team with a solid reputation for writing hit pop songs. Within a year, The Monkees had another hit with the Goffin & King-penned “Pleasant Valley Sunday.” This commentary on the static and monotonous lifestyle of middle-class suburbia provided a complex critique, as the corporately constructed band that performed the song was a product of the consumer-driven, conformist society the song derided. Complicating these controversial messages even more was that the intended audience for *The Monkees* was pre-adolescent children, who typically were shielded from the harshest of social critiques. The corporately designed American band created to ease generational social tensions instead performed songs, written by the previously compliant Brill Building songwriters, which directly critiqued the situations that inspired such significant social contention. However, The Monkees did succeed in generating profits for American producers; in 1967, they sold more records than The Beatles and The Rolling Stones combined.

By the time of their second season premiere, *The Monkees* transitioned themselves into a socially aware group of young artists who insisted on performing their own music with their television show as a showcase for their songs, quickly supplanting the façade of a fictional musical group played by actors. This transition complemented interview segments at the end of their television episodes in which the musicians, not their scripted characters, discussed contemporary social issues, offsetting the fanciful plots and chaotic comedic romps. In these interviews, the four young men who comprised *The Monkees* – David Jones, Micky Dolenz, Peter Tork, and Michael Nesmith – discussed youth demonstrations, generational conflicts, the hippie movement, and other issues associated with the counterculture. In essence, the members of *The Monkees*, speaking as real young adults and not a fictional pop band, critiqued and negotiated the difficulties youth faced as a perceived oppositional culture while they were employed by cultural producers who attempted to mitigate the tensions between youth culture and mainstream society. The negotiation between mainstream compliance and youth opposition reached a contentious peak during the show's second season; the television industry awarded *The Monkees* two Emmys, while the show included performances from countercultural performers Frank Zappa and Tim Buckley and *The Monkees'* tour featured the Jimi Hendrix Experience as an opening act. The co-option of cultural signifiers broke down, and NBC's increasing frustrations with the show's content led to the cancellation of *The Monkees* after its second season. *The Monkees* also were subjected to FBI surveillance, as their live concerts raised

concerns about “subliminal messages” and “left wing innovations of a political nature” – which, according to a 1967 FBI field office summary, “received unfavorable response from the audience.”¹³ The FBI surveyed The Monkees’ concerts in connection with “anti-Vietnam war activities,” and two files are known to exist – a heavily redacted summary of a concert, and one file that still remains classified.¹⁴

Within the pages of *16 Magazine*, few stars had ever rivaled the popularity of The Monkees. The Beatles were the only act to garner more column space and features than The Monkees during the 1960s, and several precedents set with the coverage of The Beatles were replicated during the The Monkees’ tenure. Davy, Micky, Peter, and Mike dominated *16 Magazine*’s covers, pin-ups, posters, and feature articles during 1967 and 1968. The typical “My Life in Pix,” “Hates and Loves,” and similar established features highlighted The Monkees during these years, and each individual member earned numerous features that spanned several months. Individuals associated with band members, including Nesmith’s childhood friend, Tork’s grandmother, and Jones’s costar from Broadway, were credited authors of ongoing features detailing the early years and private lives of the young men. Davy Jones was continually linked with young female celebrities, such as Sally Field, Deana Martin, and Lulu, though they were only ever described as “good friends.” Initially, coverage of The Monkees in *16 Magazine* was similar to that of any other popular act from television or music that previously had reigned as a “fave rave” among readers. However, as The Monkees’ popularity – and the controversy surrounding them –

quickly grew, Stavers just as quickly adapted the magazine's coverage of The Monkees to replicate the styles previously used with The Beatles. Similar to reducing the Mods to stylish dressers who "played it cool" for her readers, Stavers emphasized the visual elements of the counterculture and downplayed the behavior and the politics, promoting the style over the substance. She did not ignore nor debase the counterculture; she merely *filtered* it, allowing its distinctive appearance to color "Dreamsville" without its contentious politics destabilizing the imagined community.

The first appearance of The Monkees in *16 Magazine* was on the last page of the December 1966 issue, which went to press in September 1966, the same month their television show debuted. Without any reader demand, Stavers included a single page devoted to The Monkees, comprised of individual promotional photos and brief biographies of each member. Facing that page was a full-color glossy pin-up of the band in matching grey suits, visually reminiscent of the early Beatles promotional shots and television appearances in similar matching suits. Stavers did not haphazardly assign color pin-ups in *16 Magazine*, and many popular stars never earned one. From their earliest public exposure, Stavers incorporated The Monkees into "Dreamsville," confident that their music and, more importantly, their faces would become popular among her readers and supplant the quickly-maturing Beatles. The hopes and expectations Stavers had for The Monkees echoed those of Dick Clark, who endorsed their television show on a rival network – while Stavers and Clark may have had different goals in mind, both clearly believed The Monkees, as a scripted, industry-produced entity,

would be “safe” for America’s youth, and used their considerable influence within the entertainment industries to ensure continued exposure for the television show and its music. Worth noting, however, is that Davy Jones had been featured twice previously in *16 Magazine* as a solo performer, in 1964’s “Facts about Davy Jones” and a black-and-white pin-up in 1965. These inclusions indicate that Jones already was positioned as a potential teen idol years before *The Monkees* debuted on network television.

By February 1967, The Monkees were the lead “fave raves” in *16 Magazine*, with Nesmith, Jones, and Tork included in that month’s cartoonish cover montage, and one half of a two-page glossy pinup of the band displacing the usual Beatles pinup inside the front cover. That transition was indicative of how the magazine was about to replicate the patterns used throughout The Beatles’ reign. Over the next few years, The Monkees would merit their own mail-order publications, special feature issues, and even a “Kiss Your Favorite Monkee” feature, comprised of close-up photos of each Monkee’s mouth – The Beatles were the only other act previously to warrant that epitome of “Dreamsville” fantasy. If readers were uncertain of switching their loyalty from The Beatles to The Monkees, Gloria Stavers provided assurance in the June 1967 feature “The Monkees Meet The Beatles - & Take England By Storm!” This eight-page pictorial featured The Monkees’ first promotional trip to England, and included numerous pictures of various Monkees and Beatles enjoying their time together socializing, shopping, and in recording sessions. A color pinup of Micky Dolenz and Paul McCartney smiling together is the centerpiece of the feature,

and – foreshadowing a parallel that would develop over the next year – pictures of Dolenz and Samantha Juste together on a production set and Michael and Phyllis Nesmith chatting and laughing with Cynthia Lennon were also included.

Gloria Stavers faced a similar challenge with The Monkees and their ladies as she had with The Beatles a few years earlier. Again, rather than presenting the women as competition, she utilized their roles in the lives of the “fave raves” to her advantage. Phyllis Nesmith, already married to Michael and a mother at the time of *The Monkees*’ debut, became the “Cynthia figure.” Nesmith never hid his wife and child from public knowledge, though he was very protective of them. Stavers presented the Nesmith marriage as she had the marriage of John and Cynthia Lennon - the most stable and consistent element of the young man’s life, a calm oasis in a chaotic storm of immense and rapid popularity, and an established tradition superseding an anti-Establishment image. The Nesmith house was featured several times in *16 Magazine*, always as a comfortable, tidy, luxurious home where Michael could retreat from his stressful work. For example, in October 1967’s “Monkees & You!” David Pearl, a friend of the band, narrates a visit to the homes of Nesmith and Dolenz, inviting the reader “to take a magic-carpet ride into the very private lives of Mike and Phyllis Nesmith...” The narrative describes the heavily secured area of Bel-Air where the Nesmiths lived, along with a detailed description of their expansive estate, noting their electric fence and security cameras. Phyllis quickly greets the visitor and provides a guided tour of the home, explaining, “I guess you could call us super security-conscious.” The narrative clarifies these unusual measures for

the reader: “You don’t say anything, but you understand. It’s just one of Mike’s many ways of showing his deep love for his wife and his son, Christian.” Photos of Christian alone and with Phyllis are included, emphasizing the *normal* family life of the Nesmiths. The reader is introduced to their son, “a perfect mixture of his mom and dad,” before “Phyllis takes you off to the kitchen, of which she is very proud. You are amazed by it...” The reader is presented with a ready-made “Dreamsville” fantasy, beginning with the “magic-carpet ride” into the Nesmiths’ private life, meeting their son, and reinforcing the happiness and comforts of marriage and parenthood – as well as the awe-inspiring aspects of consumerism and having an amazing kitchen. The fantasy continues as the family takes the reader to the home of their friend Micky Dolenz for a similar tour, and wraps up as Dolenz “reaches out and takes your hand, and gives you a little kiss on the cheek.”¹⁵ After reading this feature, the reader’s imagined community had expanded to include idealized married role models and a potential suitor within The Monkees’ contingent, very similar to how John and Cynthia Lennon and their friend Paul McCartney had been portrayed for the previous cycle’s fan base.

If Phyllis Nesmith was *16 Magazine’s* “new Cynthia,” then Samantha Juste was the “new Pattie.” Juste, a British model and television host, began dating Micky Dolenz during The Monkees’ first visit to England in January 1967, and ultimately the couple married in July 1968. Juste moved to Los Angeles in early 1967, garnered attention in the United States by attending the Monterey International Pop Festival with Dolenz in June 1967, and became the most prominent woman associated with The Monkees as the couple’s relationship

developed. Though rumors of their engagement often were denied in *16 Magazine*, Juste – or “Sammy,” as she was known among friends and fans – clearly was deeply ensconced in Dolenz’s life, and was the best-known and best-loved of the Monkee girlfriends. Her “Sammy’s Beauty Secrets” column, spanning several issues in 1968, was very reminiscent of “Pattie Boyd’s Beauty Box,” detailing skin care, makeup, and hair styling, but also endorsing specific brand-name products, more in line with Cher’s beauty columns. Juste’s popularity with readers was evident from her inclusion in several *16 Magazine* cover montages, frequent inclusion in features about The Monkees, and regular incorporation into contests, “GeeGee’s Gossip,” and other typical features. Though Juste was dating a “fave rave,” she was brought into the imagined community as a friend and advisor, just as Pattie Boyd was in the previous cycle. However, Juste’s role in the “Dreamsville” community was markedly different from Boyd’s as well.

Whereas Phyllis was the respected role model as wife and mother, Sammy was the British bird who evolved into a secret sister – the model who set aside her career to become a wife and mother, the British girl who left England behind by embracing American culture and a life with the man she loved. Sammy was a hybrid of the previous cycle’s distinctly different British and American female celebrities – she was British by birth, but American by choice. The strict “us and them” distinctions within *16 Magazine*’s imagined community had diminished. No longer were distinctions as boldly drawn between British and American stars; as a more cohesive global youth culture developed, its

commonalities across cultures were emphasized. Samantha Juste was an example of a young woman with greater agency and autonomy than most previously featured female celebrities – she represented that the differences could be bridged, and the distinctions could be mitigated. Very subtly though, as she broadened the scope of *Dreamsville*, Gloria Stavers also used Samantha Juste as a means to reinforce the priorities of traditional American life and behavior – after all, Sammy *chose* to become an American girl, wife, and mother.

The Nesmith and Dolenz marriages were included in an unusual article for *16 Magazine*, “Teen-Star Marriages!” in January 1969. Typically, when a celebrity marriage dissolved, Gloria Stavers addressed the news in a brief item in one of the magazine’s gossip columns, but rarely identified the reasons for the break-up. However, this article, subtitled “The truth about the marital bliss – or lack of it – of some of your fave stars” and featuring a group photo of the two Monkees with their wives, exemplified Stavers’s dedication to being direct, if not completely forthright, with her readers, even if the subject matter contrasted with the magazine’s general approach to romance and marriage. In her usual advisory tone, Stavers began by explaining that “almost all married couples have their ups and downs, but maintaining wedded bliss is even more difficult when one (or both) of the people involved is a ‘star’.” She then discussed the impending divorce of John and Cynthia Lennon, noting that “John has appeared in public holding hands with Japanese artist Yoko Ono on several occasions and he has even stated publicly that he loves Yoko.” However, maintaining hope that a happy ending could be in store for John and Cynthia, she noted “Beatle fans

still hope that a miracle will occur and that Cynthia and John will be reunited.” The next “top-star ‘shaky’ marriage” chronicled is that of Michael and Phyllis Nesmith, who, “like any normal married couple... have had their differences over the past few years.” Stavers mentioned that Phyllis moved out their home, taking their two children with her, and enrolled in college. However, after some time apart, Phyllis returned “and all seems well in the Nesmith household!” The “differences” to which Stavers alluded are not detailed, and she clearly chose to omit from her account the primary “difference” behind the couple’s separation, which was included in coverage in other teen magazines at the time – Michael’s infidelity and subsequent fathering of another child with a woman other than his wife. However, the piece quickly shifts to Micky and Sammy Dolenz “expecting a little Dolenz ‘bundle from heaven,’” mitigating any concerns about discord within the Monkee marriages.¹⁶

While *16 Magazine*’s readers might not have understood the complexities of complicated adult relationships, infidelity, the sexual revolution, nor “bed-ins,” they could grasp that a man holding hands with a woman other than his wife was troubling, or a that a “bundle from heaven” would be welcomed by a newlywed couple. Gloria Stavers did not so much hide the truth from her readers, for she knew they could find the details elsewhere – but she chose to *filter* the concepts in such a way that the young readers of the magazine could absorb them and, ultimately, learn a bit about the realities of marriage that their parents may have hidden from them. Despite other publications’ tabloid-style coverage of these stars’ private lives and critiques that the “free love” lifestyle of these anti-

Establishment youths diminished the sanctity of marriage, Stavers maintained her position of supporting and promoting “traditional” romance and marriage within the “Dreamsville” of *16 Magazine*, and perpetuated her approach with announcements of weddings and births for most young celebrities of the era. As she had done throughout her tenure as editor, Stavers frequently celebrated the concept of family in *16 Magazine* with pictorials of stars’ wedding days, as proud parents with their babies or toddlers, or spending time with their own parents and siblings.

Attempting to Decipher the Counterculture

As the counterculture became a more contentious topic amongst mainstream Americans, mass media outlets attempted to decipher and explain elements of what it was and the impact it had on American politics and society, especially youth. Images of congregating hippies, Vietnam war protest rallies, feminist protests, and Black Power demonstrations saturated television newscasts and mass market magazines and newspapers, while rhetoric used among those participating in the movements became more commonly integrated into everyday conversation. For most Americans, the upset in social order and rapid changes demanded by radical groups were of concern, especially as those changes were associated with America’s youth. The most tangible element of these anti-Establishment movements that the media, and many adults, could grasp was that they looked *different*. Men with long hair, women with short hair, and African-Americans growing out their hair into natural afros, along with styles

inspired by traditional Native American, African, and Mexican cultures permeating hippie communities, signaled a shift in youth attitudes. No longer were young people generally complying with the traditional styles prescribed by mass producers; instead, they sought their own styles based on personal preference and self-identification.

Similar to the English Mods before them, these subcultural groups rejected the blind adherence to tradition they perceived among the parent culture. For example, taking elements of the traditional “uniform” of a responsible adult and exaggerating them was one form of rejection, with wildly patterned dress shirts and ties popular among young men. Denim blue jeans, long associated with working-class laborers, became even more popular among young people than they were in the 1950s. The hippie girl’s maxi-skirt symbolized a rejection of the A-line and pencil skirts of her mother’s generation, as well as the mini-skirt that had become a designer fashion statement. Incorporating leather, feathers, flowers, turquoise, and silver into accessories revealed an appreciation and integration of ethnic cultures and natural elements into personal styles. Young women rejected the heavy makeup associated with mid-century femininity, opting for a more “natural” look free of cosmetics. Young men expressed their “natural” look by growing their hair longer, including moustaches, beards, and sideburns. Some white men even grew and styled their hair to emulate the afro hairstyle of African-Americans, including youth idols such as Bob Dylan, Eric Clapton, and Micky Dolenz.

Before long, the image signifiers of the counterculture were fully integrated into network television as well, mitigating their impact and reducing them to the next fashion trend. Dick Clark and Ed Sullivan appeared on their weekly television shows with long sideburns and paisley ties, presenting acts such as Jefferson Airplane, Buffalo Springfield, The Doors, and Janis Joplin. Mama Cass guest-hosted for Johnny Carson on *The Tonight Show*, and Republican presidential candidate Richard Nixon appeared on *Laugh-In*. Police drama *Dagnet* regularly incorporated storylines that dealt with radicals, illegal drugs, and young runaways. By the time *The Mod Squad* debuted on ABC in September 1968, its young counterculture protagonists were not perceived so much as “radical,” as they were hip young people. The “flower children” had entered the mainstream, in fashion if not in behavior.

The Los Angeles music scene integrated elements of its traditional studio musicians and songwriters with sounds and images derived from the hippie culture. The Laurel Canyon and Hollywood Hills areas became a hotbed of creativity and symbiosis, as musicians, actors, and their friends and fans intertwined in the social and music communities, reminiscent of the Swinging London scene from just a few years earlier. Numerous interviews and documentaries reveal the jam sessions held at various performers’ homes, where pop icons, rock stars, underground musicians, television actors, and their neighbors gathered to socialize, write and perform music, create art, consume drugs, and engage in romantic relationships, some of which characterized the mores of “free love” and the sexual revolution. Among the most frequent

members of these gatherings were The Mamas and The Papas' Mama Cass, The Monkees' Peter Tork, The Byrds' David Crosby, Buffalo Springfield's Stephen Stills, The Hollies' Graham Nash, The Doors' Jim Morrison, and The Beach Boys' Dennis Wilson, along with their bandmates and friends. By late 1967, American pop and rock music regained momentum and significant sales, supplanting the dominance of British Invasion bands from just a few years earlier.

As the parent culture noticed these patterns and trends, as well as the popularity and profitability of the artists embracing them, the absorption of the styles into the mainstream became more common. Again replicating the progression of the English Mod movement, the meanings and symbolism of various style elements were diminished as the consumer marketplace became filled with mass-produced styles of clothing, cosmetics, and accessories that imitated the "hippie look." Just as it had done with its "Swinging London" cover story in April 1966, *Time* attempted to decipher and describe the hippie culture with a cover story in July 1967 and another feature story in October 1967. Numerous television news documentaries and profiles depicted the hippie lifestyle, the "Summer of Love" in 1967, and the subculture movements associated with them. With San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district becoming the most visible center of hippie culture, attention turned to California again, as it had during the early days of the free speech and students' rights movements. The Monterey International Pop Festival, organized by producer Lou Adler, musician John Phillips, and publicist Derek Taylor, brought together a multitude of performers, fans, and celebrity attendees into a peaceful weekend of music and

culture in June 1967. Groundbreaking performances from the Jimi Hendrix Experience, Big Brother and the Holding Company featuring Janis Joplin, Otis Redding, The Who, and Ravi Shankar highlighted the festival, while the artists performed for free and all generated revenue was donated to charity. The “peace and love” sentiment was represented well, with no notable criminal activity and local authorities pleasantly surprised by how well the large congregation respected the community around them.

The hippies were not the only element of youth culture that *Time* attempted to decipher in 1967. In the sardonic “Aiming at the Hip,” *Time* assessed teen magazines, highlighting Mark Lindsay as a pop idol largely unknown to the “square... jerk paranoid” types who were “just over 25 and into the twilight of life.” The phenomenally high sales of teen magazines were revealed, noting that “half a dozen monthlies are healthily selling half a million copies and more... [to] almost entirely girls... So teen publishers tune their message to girls between ten and 18... [and] all the mags strive to respond to their readers’ letters.” Quoting Robert MacLeod from *Teen*, “It demonstrates these girls’ great hunger to be involved. A magazine is a personal thing to them.” MacLeod echoed Gloria Stavers’s own comments regarding letters from her readers, and the *Time* article notes that *16 Magazine*, as well as *Ingenue* and *Teen*, each “handle[d] more than 50,000 [letters] a month.” Stephen Kahn, editor of *Flip*, revealed a key element of the formula for success of these teen magazines: “These books are sexless, innocent, good books. When the girls get older and begin to think about sex, they can go on to other magazines. We’re

through with them.”¹⁷ Kahn’s statements are very similar to Gloria Stavers belief, stated a bit more gracefully in her *Saturday Evening Post Magazine* profile a few months later, that when “a girl actually reaches sixteen she’s ready to leave the dreamworld, and 16 is way behind her.”¹⁸

At the time of the *Time* profile, *16 Magazine* boasted in its masthead that it was the “Top Favorite of Over Five Million Teeners.” At a time when the counterculture cast suspicion on anyone over 30, Gloria Stavers maintained the attention of more readers than any other teen magazine, despite being nearly 40 years old herself. She helped her readers make sense of the incredibly confusing, constantly changing world around them, and did so with an insight and compassion her competitors did not display. As she explained, “I have this button in my head... I push it and I become thirteen again, and I remember all the things I longed for. I don’t want to sound conceited, but the other magazines can’t reach these children the way I can.”¹⁹ As the only female editor of a teen magazine, Stavers believed her innate sense of what was important to girls came from experience that was unique to her among the dozens of magazine editors who strived to appeal to the same audience.

16 Magazine’s longest featured “secret sister” (and brother-in-law), Cher and her husband Sonny continued their advice column through June 1969. They maintained a level of consistency in the magazine through the years of Beatlemania, Raider Revolution, and Monkee Mayhem. This continuity was important to Gloria Stavers, as she always wanted to provide a comfortable, reassuring environment for her readers as they struggled with the rapid changes,

both personal and more broadly social, of their adolescence. Sonny and Cher were an excellent model for Stavers to utilize, as they were very hip and trendy, very popular and successful in the music industry, and *looked* the part of counterculture figures, with their long hair, hippie fashions, and subtle critiques of older generational mores in their songs. Paramount to their exposure in *16 Magazine*, however, was the fact that they were *married*. Stavers sought to emphasize that while the values in the broader culture may seem to be changing, the traditional, established core of the American family as being central to national strength and unity was still imperative. Though Sonny and Cher chose to embrace the visual signifiers of the counterculture, and were involved in the entertainment industry, their status as married partners in work and life was the most alluring draw during their tenure as advisors in *16 Magazine*. As the magazine transitioned to new advisors, siblings Lucie and Desi Arnaz, Jr., in July 1969, a note addressed to *16 Magazine's* readers from Sonny and Cher introduced the new column:

We both would like to thank each and every one of you for the honor and the privilege of allowing us to share your private world with us... Now that we have our new little daughter – Chastity – to look after, we cannot devote the necessary time and attention to properly addressing your letters, so we feel that it is time to step aside...²⁰

The note attributed to Sonny and Cher indicates that while they valued their inclusion as trusted advisors in *16 Magazine's* "Dreamsville," their top priority was being parents to their own child. Of course, their popularity – and even familiarity - with young readers also was ebbing, as their chart success as a duo diminished, Cher transitioned into a solo singing career, and their marriage

began to splinter. Since having Sonny as a “secret brother” appealed to readers so greatly, Stavers found the young Arnaz siblings to replace the couple, likely believing that a brother and sister “couple” would be just as reliable as the previously stalwart Sonny and Cher.

It is crucial to recognize Stavers’s influence on both her readers and the music industry in this era, beyond the obvious pop icons who garnered most of the mass media’s attention. Despite the generational difference between her and the magazine’s audience, as well as the performers appearing in *16 Magazine*, Stavers’s approval of an act was incredibly important to rising stars. As William Kloman pointed out in 1967, “Record companies seek Gloria’s approval before launching publicity campaigns for new artists. Bob Dylan was in the habit of personally playing his new songs over the phone for Gloria to get her reaction. Screen Gems recently flew her to the West Coast to pass judgment on a group they are grooming to follow in the Monkees’ profitable footsteps, and Columbia Records, hearing she was in Los Angeles, offered to pack up their new group, the Moby Grape, and fly them down from San Francisco so Gloria could have a look.”²¹ Even icons of anti-Establishment culture sought the approval of Gloria Stavers – and sometimes enthusiastically received it.

In December 1965, Dylan received his first full profile in *16 Magazine*, “2 Sides of Bob Dylan,” after having his albums regularly recommended by Stavers in her columns. Immediately acknowledging his intriguing character, the feature begins, “We’ll start with *two*. Though there are many...,” clearly indicating that this was not a character who neatly fit into the “us and them” binaries already so

well-established during this era. A brief biography follows, incorporating references to his song lyrics, but underscoring the ever-changing aspects of his life and music. “He observed, listened and learned – and finally emerged with his *own* style.” The second side of Dylan is described in a flowing, stream of consciousness style: “Don’t try to define it – groove with it... CBS stopped him from singing a “controversial” song on *The Ed Sullivan Show*. Ed said yes. Bob said yes. But somebody upstairs screamed *no!* Couldn’t he please sing something *non-*“controversial? Ixnay. Bye.” Stavers cleverly made the unidentified censor the square Establishment obstacle – not Ed Sullivan, and certainly not Dylan himself. The profile continues, “Always changing... Life-sized, six-dimensional, panoramic kaleidoscope... You’ll get it from Dylan. He never cheats. You get *more* than your money’s worth. Just go and do it. You’ll flip out – no, *in.*”²²

This profile signaled a departure from the usual pop star features that Stavers included in *16 Magazine*. Notably, the photos are publicity shots and no direct contact with the artist is implied. This was not “Bob’s Hates and Loves” or “A Day with Bob Dylan,” but a distant, yet personal observation of an artist gaining fame and notoriety among youth. Dylan was not pin-up material – he was cool and hip, but not “cute and loveable” the way Herman’s Hermits were. Bob Dylan was not conventionally “dreamy” in a visual way, but he exuded depth that typical teen idols did not. There was an established distance with Bob Dylan, and certainly no behind-the-scenes or “at home” features with the notoriously private musician. The biggest problem perhaps was that Dylan was American, yet his

behavior (and subject matter of his songs) was not exactly to be embraced and emulated by young girls trying to “fit in” and act “appropriately.” Dylan was a folk singer, writing and singing of civil rights infractions, racial discrimination, and the blight of poverty. His songs were critical of aspects of American life and politics. But Gloria Stavers did not discourage her readers from his thoughts and music – instead, “Open your head and you’ll be amazed at how much it can hold. And just when it seems full, it ups and demands *more...*” Stavers implied that Dylan incorporated substantive concepts in his songs – and that young people could learn plenty about the world around them if they listened to his music - but nowhere did Stavers ever acknowledge what exactly he would tell you.

Several months later, another feature entitled “The Secret Life of Bob Dylan” discussed not his private life per se, but his “inner self.” “Within each man is a ‘private person’ – the inner self. There, in contemplation and peace, the secret life is lived – and works of creation begin. In Bob Dylan’s secret life, the works of William Blake are often read – as are those of the controversial American writer, William Burroughs.” Again, Stavers includes “controversial” in a discussion of Dylan. The warning is evident to the reader, yet serves as an enticement too. Dylan’s atypical, non-conformist, anti-Establishment personality is highlighted, as he clearly is not like other “boys”: “It is this unusual ability to relate *intensely* to *all* he encounters that has set Bob Dylan apart as a writer and as a human being.”²³ Dylan is an individual, not one of the boyish “them” to the readers’ “us.” Notably, neither of these Dylan features was promoted on the cover of its issue, perhaps because Bob Dylan did not fit in with the exuberance

and silliness of *16 Magazine*'s composite covers. Both articles ran during the peak of Dylan's Top 40 career, when he scored three consecutive Top Ten singles with "Like A Rolling Stone," "Positively 4th Street," and "Rainy Day Women #12 and 35"; and reached the Top Ten on the album charts with *Bringing It All Back Home*, *Highway 61 Revisited*, and *Blonde on Blonde*.²⁴ After Dylan was involved in a motorcycle crash and lengthy convalescence in 1966, Stavers announced his return to the music scene subtly yet joyfully in the July 1967 "GeeGee's Gossip" column: "By the time you read this, Bob Dylan will be back with us. At least, if my dreams come true – he will. Meanwhile... become a 'flower child.' Show Love."²⁵ Stavers confirmed the good news the following month: "Dreams do come true. Dylan lives!"²⁶ Despite his non-conformist lyrics and influences, Stavers still included this popular artist in the magazine, controversial in his own right, to satisfy the curiosity of readers who were individuals themselves, those who might not debate whether John or Paul is cuter or necessarily need Connie Francis to give them sisterly advice, but were looking for something more, something deeper and less superficial. *16 Magazine* itself was maturing as well.

Gloria Stavers introduced her readers to perhaps the most curious and atypical "fave rave" of her tenure in November 1967. Again with no mention on the typically cartoonish cover, "Meet Jim Morrison – of The Doors" was the first feature to depict The Doors' lead singer and carried the important "by Gloria Stavers" byline to ensure that readers understood the editor's approval and endorsement of the artist. Jim Morrison was distinctly different from any previous

“fave rave” in that he was never portrayed as anything resembling a typical “boy.”

He was portrayed to the readers of *16 Magazine* as “different” from the start:

The facts are very simple. So simple that they might mislead you into thinking that the young man whose picture you see on this page is – well, a lot like a lot of other young men. But he *isn't*... for Jim Morrison is not like any other pop singer to appear on the scene: past, present or future. One word that can describe him is ‘total.’ He is so whole so complete, so *all himself* and nobody or nothing else that just *meeting* him is an unforgettable experience. Hearing him *sing* and watching him perform – well, that’s *really* magic! ... So close your eyes, open your mind and take my hand while I try to lead you through ‘Jim Morrison’s magic land’.²⁷

Aware that Morrison’s intensity could intimidate young readers, Stavers assured them of their safety by offering her hand to guide them through the strange trip they were about to take. Stavers’s description of Morrison and his performance style emulated those her young readers infatuated with their “fave raves” would write, but in much more explicit terms, with colorful, risqué language bordering on erotic:

Then, seemingly from nowhere, a figure leaps onto the stage. It’s him – Jim Morrison! And you feel something you have never felt before. It’s like an electric shock that goes all through you. Jim is singing and you realize that it’s a combination of him, the way he looks and moves, and his sound that has completely turned you on. His voice is like spirals of flame... *Come on, baby, light my fire*... He is singing it to you and all at once the room around you seems to glow. At first it’s warm, then it’s hot – like something burning, but it doesn’t hurt. You dig it. It’s the *fire* – the fire that Jim is singing about. The fire that he *knows all about* and now – suddenly – *you do too!* You are consumed by his vibrant presence and his sensational singing. He *is* electric. He *is* magic. He *is* all afire. And everything that he is, he is giving to you freely and totally!²⁸

Gloria Stavers herself was enamored with Jim Morrison, and she fascinated him. Legendary stories of a heated affair between the two are included in most Morrison biographies, and The Doors recorded a version of Van

Morrison's "Gloria" which loosely described the pair's affair. Morrison agreed to one-on-one photo shoots and private conversations with the teen magazine editor, which did not resonate with the band's decidedly counterculture image and sound. Many of Stavers's photos of Morrison have become legendary images, showing a young, bare-chested pop star adorned in love beads and a leather-clad, moody young man in pensive thought. Jim Morrison was prominently featured, at times with The Doors, in *16 Magazine* through 1968, with feature articles, psychedelic color pin-ups, even as the protagonist in fiction stories, including "Jim and the 'Magic Gift.'" In a two-part tale, Jim meets a nameless teenage girl at a concert who is all too quickly escorted away by a security guard. Ultimately, "he was happy – *very happy*. He knew that wherever she was, she was happy too. For they both had been enriched by each other beyond space and time. They each had given the other the gift of love."²⁹

Despite Stavers's earnest attempts at creating sensual "fave raves" of Morrison and the band, the magazine's readers were not as enraptured as she was. The Doors earned three Top Ten songs, including the Number One hits "Light My Fire" and "Hello, I Love You," but quickly faded from Top 40 radio airplay. Morrison's erratic behavior, troubled private life, and arrests in various cities gained significant unfavorable media attention and put limitations on television and live appearances in the United States for the band. Whether it was the lack of visibility, or the unstable and extreme behavior of Morrison, despite the great extent of the editor's efforts, young readers did not gravitate to this counterculture "heartthrob." Stavers did note his death with a half-page obituary

in the October 1971 issue of *16 Magazine*; a pensive close-up of Morrison's face is accompanied simply by the lyrics to his song "When the Music's Over." Ten years after his death, and despite her best efforts, Stavers recalled, "Morrison was never one of our big draws."³⁰

Stavers found ways to incorporate numerous anti-Establishment rock acts into the monthly features of *16 Magazine*. She often recommended new artists and their albums in her columns, many of which were not Top 40-bound; psychedelic, jazz, blues, and soul artists were regularly included among her recommendations, and in the late '60s, Stavers endorsed new releases by Janis Joplin, Jimi Hendrix, Pink Floyd, John Coltrane, Moby Grape, The Who, Jefferson Airplane, Cream, Joan Baez, Neil Young, Tyrannosaurus Rex, and the *Easy Rider* soundtrack, along with the standard fare from the latest pop acts. Another feature that regularly incorporated counterculture musicians was the monthly "Spot the Errors" contest, in which readers would find discrepancies between two similar drawings, circle the differences, and submit their entry form for a chance to win prizes. In the early '60s, "Spot the Errors" featured celebrities who were not "fave raves" – usually stars of television westerns, less popular British musicians, and folk singers. By the late '60s, "Spot the Errors" regularly featured counterculture rock bands, including Frank Zappa and the Mothers of Invention, the Grateful Dead, The Doors, Electric Flag, Canned Heat, Country Joe and the Fish, Big Brother and the Holding Company, the Buddy Miles Express, and the Flying Burrito Brothers. Stavers utilized the "Spot the Errors" feature in a very savvy fashion; while appealing to fans of these anti-

Establishment acts by incorporating them into the content of the magazine, she also highlighted their *differences* by subtly indicating that there was something not right about them, as their “errors” were the focus of attention.

By the end of the decade, family act The Cowsills were among the top “fave raves” in *16 Magazine*. The Cowsills provided many of the elements Gloria Stavers preferred to emphasize among the featured acts in the magazine. They were a *family* that worked and travelled together, led by mother Barbara and including brothers Bill, Bob, Barry, John, and Paul, as well as sister Susan. The young men and their sister fit into the “Dreamsville” of *16 Magazine* quite well, with ages ranging from eight to nineteen in 1967; while the brothers could serve as objects of romantic fantasy, Susan herself was in the same age cohort as many readers. Their bandmate-mother and manager-father clearly supported the young stars’ aspirations, and The Cowsills achieved great, if short-lived, success on the Top 40 charts. Curiously, after The Cowsills’ first hit, “The Rain, The Park, and Other Things,” a psychedelic pop fantasy about a young hippie which featured the refrain “I love the flower girl,” reached Number Two on the Billboard Top 40 chart, they were asked to record a version of the theme song from the Broadway musical *Hair*. The juxtaposition of a family act singing about counterculture style, with a song taken from a stage show that espoused the sexual revolution, portrayed illegal drug use, and featured nudity, showed that the times clearly had changed. For young music fans who were not aware of the controversial musical, however, The Cowsills’ hit was an entertaining description of the “long-haired weirdo” fads and trends that had become commonplace

among young Americans. The Cowsills' reign in *16 Magazine* came to an end by 1970, when two new family acts came to dominate the magazine's features: The Jackson Five and television's *The Partridge Family*, based in concept on The Cowsills themselves.

Expanding the Parameters of "Dreamsville"

The "Dreamsville" of *16 Magazine* in the late 1960s incorporated a wider swath of diversity than the standard young white men and women of European descent who dominated the magazine to this point. While the "other" in various forms was embraced, as aliens from *Star Trek* and monsters from *Dark Shadows* became subjects of numerous *16 Magazine* features and pinups, other ethnicities became more common in the magazine's features. Just a few years after the clear differences between the "us and them" of American and British celebrities was displayed prominently, Sajid Khan was one of *16 Magazine*'s most popular "fave raves." Khan and Jay North co-starred in NBC's *Maya*, a short-lived television adventure show based on a feature film in which two teenagers travelled around India searching for the American boy's father. Though the show only ran from September 1967 to February 1968, Khan's duration as a *16 Magazine* favorite among readers lasted much longer. First featured in November 1967's "Meet Jay North & Sajid Kahn [sic]," Khan was described as "a handsome, black-haired, brown-eyed boy who is known through India, his native land, as 'Son of India'..." The article continued with a description of Khan's early years as an orphan and his first acting roles, then summarized the relationship

between North and Khan: “Jay, who accompanied him on [his first tour of the United States], took special delight in introducing Sajid to American manners and customs... Jay whisked the young Hindu off to Shea Stadium to see a game.” Before Khan was established as *too* different, however, he was revealed to be very enthusiastic about American culture, as he was “particularly fired-up over American football... swimming, jazz and rock ‘n’ roll, dancing, fishing, soft drinks and James Bond movies.” A color pinup was featured on the page opposite the article, with Khan donning a Mod Beatle-style haircut and a suit and tie.³¹

In the months that followed, Khan was profiled in the typical *16 Magazine* style, the focus of “My Life in Pix,” “My Hates and Loves,” and “My Dream Girl” features, all of which accentuated the differences between Indian and American cultures and especially girls, of whom Sajid claimed to prefer the more independent American girls. However, he also was the subject of a particular feature that no other member of “Dreamsville” ever received – a plea to stay in the United States. In “Sajid Asks You: HELP ME TO STAY HERE!” Khan directly addressed the readers, requesting that they send him letters of support as he faced a possible return to India. Highlighting his “otherness” yet underscoring his adoration for American life and culture, Khan began his letter by emphasizing the support shown to him by “your friend and mine, Gloria Stavers.” He continued with his enthusiastic appreciation for America, “a country full of beautiful, wonderful people and untold opportunities.” His plea was not without rhetoric specific to the era and tinged with the communal values reflected in counterculture movements: “I have a great deal of faith in the youth of America

and their enormous power to create ‘happenings.’ It was all of you young 16-ers who helped me to ‘happen’ here in the first place. You have spoiled me – I don’t want to go away – so please help me to stay here.” The photos accompanying the letter depicted two very different images of Khan; one showed a pensive young man in a Nehru jacket, while the other featured a smiling pop idol in a denim shirt with sunglasses propped on his head.³²

Using methods similar to the “adoption” of the British Davy Jones and Samantha Juste into American culture, with their very vocal appreciation and enthusiastic displays of camaraderie with their American peers, Gloria Stavers used the Sajid Khan features in *16 Magazine* to extend the “Dreamsville” parameters even further. Khan’s popularity among *16 Magazine*’s readers coincided with the incorporation of elements of Eastern cultures into Western popular culture: George Harrison’s friendship with and tutelage under Ravi Shankar, leading to the sitar becoming a popular accent in mainstream popular music; fabrics and patterns, as well as jewelry and clothing, inspired by various Asian styles; transcendental meditation and Hollywood’s sudden fascination with the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi; and Hindu and Buddhist-inspired mysticism and philosophy. Each of these elements was featured in “Beatles – Their Joys & Sorrows” in the December 1967 issue of *16 Magazine*. This feature also included a picture of Ringo and Maureen Starr with their new son, emphasizing that family was still primary amid the exploratory practices. Stavers helped her readers connect with these facets of a culture which were far beyond the comprehension of a pre-teen. Through the promotion of Sajid Khan as a “fave rave,” Stavers

allowed her readers to fantasize about incorporating elements of Eastern culture into their “Dreamsville,” elements which they could see and sense around them among anti-Establishment youths, while maintaining the standard aspects of romantic fantasy. Also in the December 1967 issue, Stavers indicated her approval of such thought-provoking and exploratory elements of fantasy in her “La Gatita” column: “If John, Paul, George and Ringo start to spread the peaceful power of Eastern meditation and philosophy, it will probably be the greatest of a series of great gifts, which they have given us over the past several years. The word is *really* OM – and if you want to learn about it, read Herman Hesse’s *Siddartha* [sic]. The Beginning is the end.”³³

Throughout the 1960s, *16 Magazine* successfully negotiated the diversity of youth culture while reinforcing the dominant social and cultural political ideologies of the era for its young audience. While African-American performers did not receive significant promotion on the magazine’s covers, they were incorporated in *16 Magazine*’s regular features. Harry Belafonte appeared on the cover of *16 Magazine*’s second issue in July 1957, followed by Johnny Mathis on the September 1957 cover, and Chubby Checker in July 1961. However, after Stavers, as “Georgia Winters,” became editor of *16 Magazine*, black artists vanished from the magazine’s cover until 1969. Stavers did regularly recommend blues, jazz, and soul records in her columns, and was especially enthusiastic toward Sam Cooke and Otis Redding. Marvin Gaye, James Brown, Millie Smalls, and The Supremes were featured in articles in the mid-1960s, and African-American girls were included as contestants in the annual “Miss 16” contest.

Black artists were also featured in montages of popular stars on the issues' back covers through 1963 – at which point the magazine's format changed slightly to feature a single color pin-up, usually of British artists. Before the British invaded, however, photos of Jackie Wilson, Johnny Nash, Brook Benton, Hank Ballard, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, Little Eva, Clyde McPhatter, and Chuck Jackson were included to lure readers to the magazine.

Gloria Stavers included features on a wide variety of popular stars, but framed the features in the context of heterosexual romantic fantasies and inclusion in a peer community of the stars, including several icons of anti-Establishment and countercultural thought and practice. While Stavers served as an adult moderator of the “Dreamsville” fantasy space she opened up for her readers, she most successfully co-opted the signifiers and ideologies of youth culture by allowing the readers to influence the magazine's content rather than enforcing which stars they *should* favor – and, in so doing, reinforced that the majority of the magazine's audience preferred the more mainstream, less radical elements of youth culture of the era. While it could be assumed that Stavers limited inclusion of African-American artists in “Dreamsville” to avoid controversy during the height of the civil rights movement, there are other possibilities as well. Arguably, the reason why black artists disappeared from the cover of *16 Magazine* in the 1960s was that the readers were not requesting their inclusion, certainly not to the extent of the British artists who dominated the media and record charts. The Beatles, The Monkees, and Paul Revere and the Raiders received the majority of the features in the magazine from 1964 to 1970,

indicative of their popularity among *16 Magazine's* young readers during these years. However, Stavers also incorporated Bob Dylan, The Doors, and other “non-conformist” stars into the “fave rave” contingent, allowing her readers to incorporate these young men into their dreams and fantasies – and did so without ever acknowledging the social and political ramifications of what they represented in the broader culture. Instead, the anti-Establishment figures featured in the pages of *16 Magazine* merely were presented as more young men to configure into the imagined community of pop stars and celebrities. Based on reader demand, and showing acceptance of a racially-integrated “Dreamsville,” black stars began to reappear with more frequency in 1968, the most prominent of whom was Clarence Williams III, one of the stars of ABC’s *The Mod Squad*. Williams was the first black star since Chubby Checker to be featured in a *16 Magazine* cover montage, in February 1969. A few months earlier, Richard Pryor had been the first black star to ever be featured in a color photo, on the back cover of the October 1968 issue. By 1971, the covers and content of *16 Magazine* would be dominated with the next cycle’s “fave rave,” the Jackson Five.

Despite the omission of overt political and social commentary within the magazine, Gloria Stavers did acknowledge the tragic results of events and lifestyles that contributed to the tumultuous nature of the decade, notably through tributes to significant figures whose untimely deaths had an impact on her readers – or were especially resonant with Stavers herself. The first of these tributes followed the signal event of the Baby Boomer generation, the

assassination of President John F. Kennedy. In contrast to the typical font and layout of the magazine's format, a somber black-bordered box framed Stavers's message to her readers: "16 MAGAZINE GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGES AND THANKS ITS READERS FOR THE MANY BEAUTIFUL AND TOUCHING LETTERS WE HAVE RECEIVED REGARDING THE DEATH OF OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY."³⁴ Rather than trying to "make sense" of the tragedy, Stavers never wrote of it herself – however, her readers clearly reached out to *her* in their time of confusion and sorrow. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s tribute embraced a tone revealing Stavers's view of the controversial figure: "The noble prince of peace lives on in our hearts and deeds."³⁵ Stavers quoted President Lyndon B. Johnson in her tribute to Robert F. Kennedy: "He believed in the capacity of the young for excellence and the right of the old and poor to a life of dignity. Our public life is diminished by the loss."³⁶ These obituaries revealed an obvious sorrow that incorporated more than respect for these men, but a sense of personal loss as well.

Stavers even honored a "non-celebrity," George Volk, Jr., with a tribute, but his loss surely resonated with her readers – he was the brother of Paul Revere and the Raiders' bassist Phil Volk. "George Volk, Jr. – Phil's beloved older brother – was killed in a car accident in Viet Nam while serving as a pilot with the American Armed Forces there. *16* and all of its readers extend to Phil and his family their heartfelt and deepest sympathy in this time of sorrow."³⁷ This is the most direct reference to the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam that *16 Magazine* published and, though brief, highlighted the effects this divisive conflict

could have on her readers, when one of “their own” suffered a tragic loss. It also provided a sense of camaraderie, as Stavers knew that among her readers were young people who had lost relatives, friends, or neighbors in the war as well.

The last such tribute of the 1960s would appear in the November 1969 issue, bringing to a close the decade that saw the pinnacle of the influence of Gloria Stavers and *16 Magazine* in American girl culture. At the end of a year that saw the transition to the Nixon administration, continued involvement in Vietnam, Woodstock, and the Manson murders, following the assassinations of King and Kennedy the previous year, American society and culture comprised a very different environment than they had when Gloria Stavers began her tenure as the editor of *16 Magazine*. The British Invasion had propelled *16 Magazine* from the “the magazine for smart girls” to America’s most popular teen magazine with millions of readers monthly. In the midst of a scant few years, youth culture had grown and adapted, shifted and reacted, with Gloria Stavers guiding her young readers through their “Dreamsville.” However, perhaps even Stavers knew the landscape was changing beyond her influence, and her tribute to Brian Jones indicated the end of an era. The former guitarist for the Rolling Stones had been the band’s most popular member among the readers of *16 Magazine*, and his obituary featured a photo of him from several years earlier, before drugs and alcohol rapidly accelerated his downfall. Serenely playing his sitar, Jones is wearing all white, gazing into the distance, accompanied by a quote from Percy Bysshe Shelley: “He has awakened from this dream of life...”³⁸ As Gloria Stavers

bid farewell to Brian Jones, she also seemed to bid farewell to the “Dreamsville” of 1960s American girl culture.

NOTES

1. Gloria Stavers, quoted in John Burks and Jerry Hopkins, *Groupies and Other Girls* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), 98.
2. Blaine R. Porter, "American Teen-Agers of the 1960's – Our Despair or Hope?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 27:2 (1965), 139-142.
3. Todd Gitlin, "Prime Time Ideology: The Hegemonic Process in Television Entertainment," in *Television: The Critical View*, ed. Horace Newcomb, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 532.
4. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Glenn C. Altschuler, *All Shook Up: How Rock 'n' Roll Changed America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).
5. John Leonard, *A Really Big Show: A Visual History of the Ed Sullivan Show* (New York: Viking Studio Books, 1992), 252-255.
6. For comprehensive information on the influence of the Brill Building writers and producers, see Ken Emerson, *Always Magic in the Air: The Bomp and Brilliance of the Brill Building Era* (New York: Viking, 2005).
7. David Halberstam, *The Fifties* (New York: Villard Books, 1993), 475.
8. These arguments were previously established and supported in detail in Diana Belscamper, "Sunday Night in America: How Ed Sullivan and The Beatles Bridged the Generation Gap" (master's thesis, Marquette University, 1998). For additional theories and examples, see Palladino.
9. For theories and examples that influenced these arguments, see Simon Frith, *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock 'n' Roll* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981); Jonathon Green, *All Dressed Up: The Sixties and the Counter-culture* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1998); Iain Chambers, *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture* (London: McMillan Publishers, Ltd., 1985); and Shawn Levy, *Ready, Steady, Go! The Smashing Rise and Giddy Fall of Swinging London* (New York: Broadway Books, 2002).
10. Aniko Bodroghkozy, *Groove Tube: Sixties Television and the Youth Rebellion* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001), 68-69.
11. Tommy Boyce and Bobby Hart, "(Theme from) The Monkees," from *The Monkees*, Colgems 101, 33 rpm, 1966.

-
12. Boyce and Hart, "Last Train to Clarksville," from *The Monkees*.
 13. "Additional Activities Denouncing the U.S. Policy in the War in Vietnam," 1967 Los Angeles Field Office memorandum. FBI Records: The Vault – The Monkees. <http://vault.fbi.gov/the-monkees>. Accessed 22 June 2013.
 14. "The Monkees." FBI Records: The Vault. <http://vault.fbi.gov/the-monkees>. Accessed 22 June 2013.
 15. David Pearl, "Monkees & You!" *16 Magazine*, October 1967, 42-43, 60.
 16. "Teen-Star Marriages! The truth about the marital bliss – or lack of it – of some of your fave stars," *16 Magazine*, January 1969, 54.
 17. "Aiming at the Hip," *Time*, 02 June 1967.
<http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,902059,00.html> (accessed 10 February 2007)
 18. Gloria Stavers, quoted in William Kloman, "Meet Gloria Stavers," *Saturday Evening Post Magazine*, November 4, 1967, 83.
 19. Stavers, in Kloman, 83.
 20. "Dear Lucie – and Desi," *16 Magazine*, July 1969, 22.
 21. Kloman, 83.
 22. "2 Sides of Bob Dylan," *16 Magazine*, December 1965, 58.
 23. "The Secret Life of Bob Dylan," *16 Magazine*, March 1966, 22.
 24. Joel Whitburn, *The Billboard Book of Top 40 Hits*, 6th ed. (New York: Billboard Books, 1996), 196; Joel Whitburn, *The Billboard Book of Top 40 Albums*, 2nd ed. (New York: Billboard Books, 1991), 88.
 25. "GeeGee's Gossip," *16 Magazine*, July 1967, 30.
 26. "GeeGee's Gossip," *16 Magazine*, August 1967, 28.
 27. Gloria Stavers, "Meet Jim Morrison – of The Doors," *16 Magazine*, November 1967, 46.
 28. "Meet Jim Morrison," 46.
 29. "Jim and the 'Magic Gift,'" *16 Magazine*, February 1968, 51.

-
30. Gloria Stavers, quoted in Rosemary Breslin, "Jim Morrison, 1981: Renew My Subscription to the Resurrection," *Rolling Stone*, 17 September 1981.
 31. "Meet Jay North & Sajid Kahn," *16 Magazine*, November 1967, 26-27.
 32. "Sajid Asks You: HELP ME TO STAY HERE!" *16 Magazine*, March 1968, 3.
 33. "The Lo-down por La Gatita," *16 Magazine*, December 1967, 4.
 34. *16 Magazine*, March 1964, 5.
 35. *16 Magazine*, July 1968, 64.
 36. *16 Magazine*, September 1968, 4.
 37. *16 Magazine*, August 1967, 65.
 38. *16 Magazine*, November 1969, 6.

Conclusion

“If you want to know what the future mothers of America are like... just read my mail. There’s a crusade on, whether parents know it or not. I think these young people... mean to flood the adult world with love. I get letters that say, ‘The adults are never going to understand unless we show them. We have to lead the way.’ And, strangely enough, these kids aren’t aware of their tremendous economic power, though, because they hear the constant adult talk about ‘teen-agers.’ The rebellion against the parent generation shows all the signs of being a really solid mass movement.”¹ - Gloria Stavers, 1967

The purpose of this project was to evaluate, through editorial and image analysis, a popular media text that reached millions of American girls every month through the 1960s. Through that evaluation, the goal was assess what *16 Magazine* offered its readers – the themes that recurred, the messages it conveyed, the images it presented, and the opportunities it provided. In essence, this assessment of *16 Magazine* was designed to appraise a noteworthy and relevant popular culture text and element of material culture that previously had not been the subject of any substantial scholarly study. Inextricably connected to such an analysis is a profile of *16 Magazine*’s editor, Gloria Stavers. Miss Stavers, as she was known to legions of pop stars and their fans, was the driving force behind the concept and content of *16 Magazine* in the 1960s. Condescendingly referred to as “Mother Superior of the Inferior” by others in the media, Stavers understood the frustrations felt by adolescent girls and was compelled to offer them guidance. She created a figurative space and an imagined community for “the Inferior” – a “Dreamsville” where they could express their concerns, voice their confusion, profess their passions, and relate to other

girls who felt the same ways they did. Whether it was through fandom of certain pop stars or seeking advice about their appearance and behavior, girls found a welcoming community that appreciated what each individual offered and understood how they all dealt with struggles in the pages of *16 Magazine*. While many adults may have considered them “the Inferior,” Gloria Stavers never did. She steadily and emphatically encouraged and inspired their development as “smart girls” with dreams and goals. The “Dreamsville” that Gloria Stavers cultivated during her tenure as editor was a welcoming environment that championed girls’ aspirations and fantasies, while promoting attitudes and behaviors that suited the era’s social mores, including “acceptable” standards of femininity and enthusiastic consumerism. The cultural dynamics of gender and generation in the 1960s were revealed in *16 Magazine*, shaping the perspectives of readers who ultimately would be “the future mothers of America.”

Though her industry competitors may have considered Stavers to be “Mother Superior,” her supporters valued her efforts to give attention and agency to girls and lauded her recognition and appreciation of what fans thought and felt about the stars. “Fave rave” Mark Lindsay called Stavers “a modern day Mother Goose” who “gave a lot of kids something to believe in that wasn’t harmful. It was Gloria’s way of making modern day fairy tales at a time when they just weren’t being written anymore.”² With images of protests, riots, assassinations, and war permeating American television and print media, young people were scared, confused, and worried about their futures, both individually and as a collective whole. *16 Magazine* provided an escape, a safe and familiar comfort zone where

girls could fantasize about the world *they* wanted – with whomever they wanted in it, and acting however they wanted to with their chosen community. They could imagine dating pop stars, socializing with female celebrities, even learning from Miss Stavers herself. “Dreamsville” was *their* world to create and adorn, with guidance and support from Gloria Stavers and the “secret sisters” she employed every step of the way.

At the time of *16 Magazine*’s inception, few mass media options were available for a strictly adolescent audience. Youth-oriented television programs were in their infancy, and few magazines targeting a young audience were published. *Seventeen* offered primarily beauty and fashion features, along with advice for girls regarding their potential roles as students, wives, and mothers and training in responsible consumerism. *Dig* and *Teen* magazines were among the other options for young readers, but focused on irreverent and superficial themes relating to teenagers. *16 Magazine* began as a teen-oriented celebrity magazine, but found its niche after Stavers took the helm and focused her attention on younger readers, those approaching and entering their early teen years. With millions of “baby boom” girls entering this age range in the early 1960s, Stavers’s shift certainly was a smart business move – but also was influenced by her belief that she was an emulous mother to her readers. As she told journalist William Kloman, “during those earlier years, I tell you true, that child is *mine*.”³

Stavers’s instincts and insight also informed her judgments regarding which stars to feature in the magazine. Her editorial decisions aligned with the

pattern identified by Vance Packard as the “three year cycle” of popular trends for youth. Stavers herself acknowledged this in 1969, as she told *Rolling Stone*, “Roughly about every three years... someone really big comes along. The Beatles brought on the whole group thing – before them, there had only been individuals. [Then] the Monkees came along...”⁴ This brief statement summarizes the three key phases of *16 Magazine* during the 1960s, each of which had its respective “fave raves” and revealed an alteration and expansion of the “Dreamsville” offered to readers. Despite the distinct cycles of popularity, certain elements of the magazine maintained continuity, including the specific columns that featured Stavers herself and the advice features that generally fell in line with the gender and generation social norms and expectations of the era.

The first phase, from roughly 1960 to 1963, established the style and format that *16 Magazine* would follow for the remainder of the decade. Fairly new to her position as editor, Stavers tinkered with the magazine’s features and included male and female stars in more proportional coverage than would occur the rest of the decade. As she noted, individual stars (rather than groups) were the popular trend during this cycle, and many of those stars had *television* in common – either as stars on sitcoms or regular exposure on the preeminent youth-oriented program of the era, *American Bandstand*. The bulk of *16 Magazine*’s features in this first phase were devoted to Rick Nelson, Paul Petersen, Shelley Fabares, Connie Francis, Annette Funicello, the “Philly Boys” (Bobby Rydell, Frankie Avalon, and Fabian), and the *American Bandstand* dancers. The interconnections between television stars and *16 Magazine*

boosted the popularity of all concerned – more exposure on television led to greater interest in the magazine’s features, and more exposure in the magazine led to greater demand on television. Dick Clark believed his symbiotic working relationship with Gloria Stavers had “a snowball effect, one augmented the other. The show grew, and so did the magazine.”⁵ Stavers especially utilized the *American Bandstand* dancers to create transmedia narratives, enhanced for those fans who regularly watched the television show and read the magazine. Having access to behind-the-scenes information on the dancers in the magazine led fans to watch the television show more intently; fans of the show who wanted gossip and personal details about their favorite dancers could go to the magazine for exclusive content. The only star who received considerable coverage during this phase who did not fit the pattern of television exposure was British teen actress Hayley Mills, who was featured in several Disney films and was about the same age as *16 Magazine*’s readers. Though she was well-liked by fans and starred in films that were popular with young audiences, her status as an outsider who was “different” was not exactly unintended, as would be revealed during the next phase.

The decade’s second phase spanned 1964 to 1966, and its theme can be summarized quite succinctly: the British Invasion. The Beatles, along with their wives and girlfriends, dominated this cycle, but the Dave Clark 5, Chad & Jeremy, and Herman’s Hermits, which featured teenage singer Peter “Herman” Noone, also were very popular with *16 Magazine* readers. Though British acts dominated the Top 40 charts and the magazine’s content, American performers

gained some popularity too. The most significant of these among *16 Magazine's* readers were Paul Revere and the Raiders; their exuberant lead singer, Mark Lindsay, was an eager participant in many *16 Magazine* features and contests, and maintained a close friendship with Gloria Stavers. The Raiders were the featured act on Dick Clark's *Where the Action Is* television show, which guaranteed them consistent exposure with young viewers for several years. As in the previous cycle, those performers who merited significant television coverage were among the most frequently featured in *16 Magazine*. The Beatles' performances on *The Ed Sullivan Show* garnered unprecedented viewing audiences, and their films attracted millions of moviegoers – many of whom attended multiple showings. The Dave Clark 5 and Herman's Hermits were among Sullivan's most frequent guests during this era as well. In addition, television stars Patty Duke and Sally Field enjoyed a fair amount of coverage in *16 Magazine* during this cycle.

Connie Francis was already established as a “secret sister” who gave advice on appearance and behavior in *16 Magazine*, and Lesley Gore joined her as an advisor during this cycle. However, the longest-lasting “secret sister” of the 1960s began her stint as a columnist during this cycle as well. Cher, often joined by her husband Sonny, was one of *16 Magazine's* most popular female stars of the decade. Her advice column ran for three years, and she was featured in beauty columns previous to that. Cher's appeal as a young American woman, recently married and with a successful career, worked well for Gloria Stavers. As she told *Rolling Stone*, readers “felt like they could talk to her – and that she

would understand them.”⁶ Cher served as an excellent contrast, in image and behavior, to *16 Magazine*’s most popular British “bird” of the era, Pattie Boyd. Boyd was featured throughout the years of The Beatles’ popularity, most often as an individual beauty and fashion expert – though her relationship with George Harrison was profiled several times, and their wedding and honeymoon pictorial was a *16 Magazine* “exclusive.” Pattie and Cher symbolized the evident contrast between “British birds” and American “secret sisters” in *16 Magazine* throughout the decade. Stavers navigated the challenges presented by the immense popularity and appeal of British styles quite adeptly. The connections between the signifiers of Mod culture and the politics of the Mods in England were mitigated, and Stavers focused on the commercial appeal of Mod fashion. In essence, a girl could look like a “bird” if she so chose, but she should act like a “sister” regardless of her style preferences.

This mitigation process occurred again in the final cycle of the 1960s, from 1967 to 1969. During these years, contentious political and social challenges to “the Establishment” were at the fore and many young Americans formed a peer coalition to counter the parent culture that they heavily critiqued. This “counterculture” was the motivation behind many protest movements and calls for changes to the political and social structure of the nation. Counterculture messages were enmeshed in popular music, as well as the lifestyles of many of the artists – the hippie lifestyle, free love, mind-altering drugs, and interest in Eastern mysticism were among the facets of the counterculture in America. The style choices made by many young people paralleled those made by active

members of countercultural movements, so hair, cosmetics, and fashion became even more contentious discrepancies between generations than they previously had been.

Within *16 Magazine*, just as had been done in the previous cycle, the language and imagery of the movement were incorporated, but the politics and social critiques the movement embraced were not. Gloria Stavers filtered the trends of the era for the magazine's audience, diminishing the volatility of the issues at hand and only incorporating style elements as the latest fads. At the same time, Stavers emphasized continuity and tradition – focusing on the relatable aspects of the counterculture icons she featured in *16 Magazine*. While Bob Dylan, Jim Morrison, the evolving Beatles and Rolling Stones, and others received coverage, The Monkees were the overwhelming “fave raves” during this cycle. They had long hair, dressed in psychedelic fashions, socialized with anti-Establishment artists, and sang about generational differences, but those elements were refocused to reveal their hip, popular status among contemporary artists. Most importantly, at least for Stavers and the “Dreamsville” she offered to readers, The Monkees had personal lives that could be portrayed as suiting the idealized romantic narratives *16 Magazine* emphasized. Davy Jones was a handsome single man who dated popular female celebrities, Micky Dolenz had a steady girlfriend who left her homeland to live with him in the United States, and Michael Nesmith was married with young children. Peter Tork, the Monkee most deeply embedded in the counterculture lifestyle, was not ignored – instead, features about his childhood and family emphasized his middle-class upbringing.

Stavers tried to contrive Dylan and Morrison into “fave rave” stereotypes with little success, but she was able to use The Monkees to bring superficial elements of the counterculture into “Dreamsville” and very effectively emphasize the traditional, established notions of romance and love amid the anti-Establishment trends of the era. Gloria Stavers chose to focus on commonalities and continuity rather than differences and radical change, highlighting common, cohesive elements that would unite her readers in an inclusive imagined community.

At the same time, Stavers supported individuality, imagination, independence, and agency among her readers, encouraging them to broaden their dreams and expand their aspirations. These sentiments were perhaps most clearly elucidated in the monthly “A Trip to Dreamsville” contest, which became one of the standard features of *16 Magazine* after its debut in early 1964. The contest stimulated the development of a consumer mindset in young readers, asking them to contemplate what possessions of their favorite stars they would like to claim as their own; signed records, concert tickets, clothing, and musical instruments were the most common tangible prizes. However, the invitation to Dreamsville itself revealed Stavers’s encouragement for her readers to set aside their expectation and strive for more, insisting that anything was possible if they set their minds and hearts in motion.

In its earliest appearances, Dreamsville was identified as “where *all* wishes come true,” and the invitation emphasized, “Nothing is beyond the reach of a regular *16* reader... Now is *your* chance to speak *your* mind – and heart.”⁷ Announcements of contest winners initially stated “These lucky girls won a trip to

Dreamsville,” until October 1964, when the phrasing changed to “The Lucky Winners of a trip to Dreamsville.” Though Stavers knew the majority of her readers were girls, she clearly made an editorial decision to eliminate gender exclusivity for the contest. Despite this change, it would be nearly four years before a boy won “A Trip to Dreamsville” – and even then, it was because his female friend submitted an entry on his behalf.⁸ The wording and format of the Dreamsville feature stayed fairly consistent for the next several years, through the British Invasion cycle. By 1965, “if you ever pretended to be Cinderella and confided in a Fairy Godmother” regularly appeared as part of the invitation, fanciful imagery that playfully depicted the emulous mother relationship Stavers believed she had with her readers.

In 1967, the invitation to Dreamsville was altered in style, incorporating imagery and lingo generally associated with a counterculture lifestyle. For the first time, Dreamsville was specifically described: “Chickadee, Dreamsville is that place way up yonder where dreams come true like they were never fulfilled before – and the pure ecstasy might just flip you out and onto a cloud so high you may never make it back to mother earth again! If you’re ready to make the trip, hang on...”⁹ Terminology often associated with taking hallucinatory drugs – “flip out,” “so high,” and “the trip” – was adapted to contextualize girls’ fantasies and aspirations, removing the potency of their origins as they were applied to innocuous adolescent dreams. By 1968, this tactic intensified as more words previously associated with counterculture lifestyles were incorporated into the Dreamsville feature, and a new Stavers character, “Dreamy,” was introduced:

HIGH, true-believers! My name is “Dreamy” – and I’m the extra-terrestrial ticket-taker and groovy guardian of the golden gates of Dreamsville. Behind these gates lies one of the most fantastic and exclusive clubs in the whole universe – and it’s reserved for each and every 16-er who believes that dreams can come true!¹⁰

A few months later, “Dreamy” greeted readers with “SALAAM,” and referred to herself as a “turned-on ticket-taker and wigged-out watch-lion of the groovy gates to Dreamsville” and promising “trippy treasures” that would “send you on a rocket ride of unadulterated joy!!”¹¹ As Jim Morrison, Sajid Khan, and Ravi Shankar provided trinkets, books, records, jewelry, and more consumer goods for lucky winners, “Dreamy” told readers to “keep sockin’ those letters to me” because “there’s plenty of room for everyone in Dreamsville.” “Dreamy” also promised, “Sooner or later, everybody who believes that dreams can come true will find themselves in Dreamsville!”¹²

As the decade came to a close, a clear sign emerged that the “Dreamsville” Gloria Stavers had cultivated throughout the decade was no longer an exclusive fantasyland for girls. In September 1969, lucky winner Jon “wrote a letter to Dreamsville saying that ‘Dreamsville is unfair to boys, cos only girls win things!’ Just to prove to Jon how wrong he is, Susie Cowsill went out of her way to send Jon on a Dreamsville trip.” Stavers’s choice to include Jon as a winner and publish his comments indicated that the Fairy Godmother was looking out for boys now too. As she responded to Jon, she gently chided, “C’mon now, Jon – Dreamsville doesn’t ‘play favorites’ – anybody can win!”¹³ Without great fanfare, by acknowledging a more inclusive environment and broader acceptance of participation in “Dreamsville,” Gloria Stavers altered the imagined community that

had developed, effectively bringing the girl culture “Dreamsville” of the 1960s to a close.

The “Dreamsville” that Gloria Stavers fostered throughout her tenure as editor of *16 Magazine*, but especially in the 1960s, was an imagined community of popular young celebrities and their fans, interacting mostly through fantasy. Just as *16 Magazine* served as an escape, it also functioned as a place where girls could imagine their own individual futures and their roles in society as they matured – as sisters, friends, girlfriends, wives, and/or mothers. But an intriguing assessment can be made of Gloria Stavers as well. Stavers was a single woman in her 30s and 40s when she was editor of *16 Magazine*, with no children of her own. She very proudly referred to the magazine’s readers as *her* children, and regarded them – faces she likely would never see, names she might never know – as important as if they were her own. Her imagined community of children bolstered her, motivated her, and inspired her to produce a publication that comprised much more than the print on its pages. Upon her death in 1983, journalist Dave Marsh described Stavers’s relationship with *16 Magazine*’s readers: “She loved her readers, the young kids from small towns who were fighting the torments of puberty with *16* as their imagination’s guide and – thanks to her advice column, among other things – their lifeline, too... There must be thousands of women, many now in middle age, who remember her as vividly as an teenage friend.”¹⁴ When she decided her time as editor of *16 Magazine* was done, she moved on to other pursuits, including working as a freelance writer and photographer for rock music publications. She had progressed past her own

“Dreamsville” of guiding girls through their formative years, and transitioned into a career that was lauded by many rock journalists and musicians. Stavers left *16 Magazine* in 1975, after sixteen years as editor. Considering her belief that “by the time a girl actually reaches sixteen she’s ready to leave the dream world,” it seems that Gloria Stavers found the same was true of herself after sixteen years in “Dreamsville.”

NOTES

1. Gloria Stavers, quoted in William Kloman, "Meet Gloria Stavers," *Saturday Evening Post Magazine*, November 4, 1967, 83.
2. Mark Lindsay, quoted in Randi Reisfeld and Danny Fields, *Who's Your Fave Rave?* (New York: Boulevard Books, 1997), 93.
3. Gloria Stavers, quoted in Kloman, 83.
4. Gloria Stavers, quoted in John Burks and Jerry Hopkins, *Groupies and Other Girls* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), 95.
5. Dick Clark, quoted in Reisfeld and Fields, xiv.
6. Gloria Stavers, in Burks and Hopkins, 96.
7. "Wanna Go To Dreamsville?" *16 Magazine*, February 1964, 29.
8. "Did You Win A Trip To Dreamsville? Look & See," *16 Magazine*, April 1968, 23.
9. "A Trip to Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, May 1967, 20.
10. "Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, June 1968, 14.
11. "Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, August 1968, 46.
12. "Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, October 1968, 24; "Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, November 1968, 54.
13. "Dreamsville," *16 Magazine*, September 1969, 23.
14. Dave Marsh, "Gloria Stavers: October 3rd, 1927 – April 1st, 1983," *Rolling Stone*, May 12, 1983, 92.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Diana L. Belscamper

Place of birth: Milwaukee, WI

Education

B.A., Marquette University, May 1995
Majors: History and English

M.A., Marquette University, December 1998
Major: U.S. History

Dissertation Title: *“Your Ticket to Dreamsville”: The Functions of 16 Magazine in American Girl Culture of the 1960s*

Teaching Experience

Lecturer, Adult and Graduate Studies, Marian University, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin (West Allis campus), 2010-present

Associate Lecturer, Department of History, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2010-2013

History Instructor, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Milwaukee Area Technical College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2007-2011

Instructor, Kaplan Test Preparation, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2007-2010

Associate Lecturer, Film Studies Program, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2008

Teaching Assistant, Department of History, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2004-2007

Teaching Assistant, Department of History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1998

Research Experience

Project Assistant, Department of History, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2005-2006, 2012-2013

Publications

Henry Aaron; BMO Harris Bradley Center; Borchert Field; Green Bay Packers; Miller Park; Milwaukee Admirals; Milwaukee Arena; Milwaukee Brewers; Milwaukee Bucks; Milwaukee County Stadium; Pettit National Ice Center; Roller Derby; Running; Allan H. "Bud" Selig; Robert Uecker; Robin Yount (Entries in *Encyclopedia of Milwaukee*, Amanda Seligman and Margo Anderson, eds., University of Northern Illinois Press, forthcoming.)

Ida Craddock; Frances Kellor; Lillian Leitzel; Agnes Nestor; Anna Caroline Maxwell; Charlotte Angas Scott; Anna Garlin Spencer; and Alzina Parsons Stevens (Entries in *Encyclopedia of American Women's History*, Hasia R. Diner, PhD, ed., Facts on File, forthcoming.)

The Case of the Paradoxical Teenage Girl: How Nancy Drew, Corliss Archer, and Gidget Pacified Patriarchal Concerns and Appeased American Girls (Book Review of *American Sweethearts: Teenage Girls in Twentieth-Century Popular Culture* by Ilana Nash), in the *Journal of Girlhood Studies*, Volume 1, Issue 1, 2008.

Presentations

Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association National Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 2014

"Social Studies of Information" Speaker Series - School of Information Sciences, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2013

"Thinking Gender" - Center for the Study of Women, University of California at Los Angeles, 2011

Center for 21st Century Studies Humanities Dissertation Presentations, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2010

Midwest Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, 2008

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Department of History Colloquium, 2008

Phi Alpha Theta Midwest Regional Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2007

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee History Department Graduate Student Colloquium, 2006

Awards/Honors

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Chancellor’s Award, 2012-2013

UCLA Film and Television Archive’s Research and Study Center Visiting Researcher Stipend, 2010

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Graduate School Fellowship, 2009-2010

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Graduate School Student of the Month, 2009

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Graduate School Dissertation Fellowship, 2008-2009

David S. Buck Honorary Dissertation Research and Travel Grant, Department of History, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2008-2009

Lucetta Bissell Memorial Fellowship, Department of History, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2007-2009

Graduate Research Grant, Department of History, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, 2008-2009

University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee Graduate School Travel Award, 2008-2009

Ignatius Scholarship, Marquette University, 1991-1995

Greater Milwaukee Scholarship, Marquette University, 1991-1995

Wisconsin Academic Excellence Scholarship, 1991-1995

Affiliations/Memberships

National Honor Society

Phi Alpha Theta

Sigma Tau Delta

American Historical Association

Society for the History of Children and Youth

Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association

Midwest Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association

University Service

Judge for National History Day, 2005-2008

Volunteer for the World History Association Conference, 2007

Volunteer for the Phi Alpha Theta Midwest Regional Conference, 2007

Organizer and leader of Teaching Assistant Orientation in the Department of History, 2006

Coordinator for the Console-ing Passions International Conference, 2006

Representative for Department of History at the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee Open House, 2005

Member and officer of Associated Students of Marquette University (ASMU), 1993-1995