ɔersonal advancement;
lities for their shares of
ian religious cults and
Within the search for spiritual wholeness and political community arises the totalitarian temptation, reaching one sort of culmination in the People's Temple; within the search for authentic personal freedom arises the old bourgeois desire to build a fortress against human bonds: each of these cultural and political projects grows rigid and self-limiting, even dangerous, in the course of excluding critical elements within the others. The radical project for the eighties is to regather the elements of cultural revolt, to form of them a coherent political opposition, and to overcome the centrifugal tendencies of the seventies: tendencies which represented the playing out of the incomplete and self-contradictory revolts of the sixties.

As the mass media have suffused social life, they have become crucial fields for the definition of social meaning—partially contested zones in which the hegemonic ideology meets its partial challenges and then adapts. The cultural industries, including the news organizations, produce self-contradictory artifacts, balancing here, absorbing there, framing and excluding and disparaging, working in complicated ways to manage and contain cultural resistance, to turn it to use as commodity and to tame and isolate intractable movements and ideas. In the process, they may actually magnify and hasten manageable forms of political change. One thing seems certain: the society will go on helplessly manufacturing, and deforming, the opposition it deserves; yet as long as the political economy continues to deliver what the majority define as the essential goods, the legitimacy crisis of the system as a whole will likely remain within bounds. A resistible hegemony is resisted because it cannot satisfy human needs; it cannot be taken entirely for granted; it is hegemony in process.

4. On new managerial ideologies, see Richard Sennett, "The Boss's New Clothes," *New York Review of Books* 26 (February 22, 1979): 42–46.

getting the whole world is vast

Appendix on Sources and Methods

THE MOVEMENT

To speak of "the movement" is already to elude sharp definition. In the 1930s and 1940s, "the movement" meant specifically the Communist Party and the organizations, projects, and institutions more or less in its orbit. But in the 1960s, "the movement" was more elusive: defining it moved into the realm of subjectivities, doubts, and quizzical quotation marks. Who was in, who was out? It depended on whom you asked, and when. And yet we must start with the fact that there were several thousand young people who, in 1963 and 1964, began to casually call themselves "the movement," to *know* themselves as "the movement," and to speak of their needs and responsibilities within "the movement." When they asked questions like "What should the movement do about the war?" they were speaking of themselves, or of "people like us," in whatever contested ways that phrase was meant. By "the movement" some meant specifically the civil rights movement, but the term usually referred to both black and white activists who shared some commitment to the realization of civil rights, peace, and some sort of radically democratic political-economic and cultural transformation, and who believed in undertaking some sort of direct action toward those ends. "New Left" was another self-determined term, first used by SDS in 1963, which deliberately adapted it from the British New Left of the late fifties. "New Left" meant both New (not Old, that is to say, neither Communist nor Social-Democratic) and Left (committed to social equality, opposed to militarism and racism, and loosely socialist).

In this movement that was both distinct and, at its boundaries, loosely defined, the two major national organizations were Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). I have written principally of SDS, which was the largest and most energetic national radical student organization throughout the sixties. (SNCC was a staff organization, an organization of organizers; it had many supporters, but no "members.") Insofar as there was an organizational (and spiritual and intellectual) center of the New Left, SDS was it, from 1960 through its dissolution into warring Leninist factions in June 1969. Ever since, SDS remains the major point of reference for analysis and discussion of the New Left.

So I have taken SDS as my major movement protagonist. Its boundaries were sharp: there were identifiable leaders, identifiable members, identifiable generations, and clear organizational procedures; this also makes SDS a convenient object of study. And I was a part of it. My experience in SDS has been first my ally, then my adversary, and finally, I trust, my plain source, impetus, and correction. I was President of SDS from June 1963 to June 1964. In 1964–65, I was an elected member of the SDS National Council, and one of two Coordinators of the SDS Peace Research and Education Project in Ann Arbor; in that capacity I helped organize the Chase Manhattan project (March 1965) and the March on Washington to End the War in Vietnam (April 1965) discussed in Part I. This makes me one of the Old Guard in SDS, though not an original member, since I was in Cambridge, Massachusetts, through June 1963, when SDS was being organized in Ann Arbor. From June 1965 through June 1966, I was one of a half-dozen members of the National Administrative Committee in Chicago, in close touch with National Office business (including the draft crisis of October 1965); I was also one of seventeen members of the National Council which met quarterly to set organizational policy. In later years, I did not maintain direct organizational ties—though I did go on attending National Council meetings and conventions through June 1967, and kept up personal contact with a number of SDS officers. Through 1968 and 1969, I grew steadily more estranged from the direction of the national organization; in opposition, indeed in fascination, I stayed aware of what was being said and done both in the National Office and a number of chapters, and worked to comprehend the drift of things. During most of that period I was an editor of the *San Francisco Express Times* and a freelance writer; I stayed in touch with a range of New Left and antiwar projects.

My own memories served as an indispensable source, then, stretched and tempered by such documentary records as exist. In the course of my research, I studied, assessed, and at times quoted from personal correspondence from that period. I also consulted my nearly complete file of SDS Work List mailings (sent every week or two to key activists from 1963 through 1966), membership bulletins, SDS pamphlets and working papers and press releases, and the weekly *New Left Notes*, which SDS published from 1966 through 1969. I interviewed key participants in the staffs and committees which I discuss. And Kirkpatrick Sale's chronicle, *SDS*, served as a valuable secondary source: his facts are accurate—no mean achievement!—and so is his rendition of the spirit and strategies of SDS leaders (though not necessarily the rank and file, and not SDS women) at various points throughout the sixties. I cross-checked and interrogated all these sources, aware of the risks of retrospective accounts, the temptations of consciously and unconsciously selective memory, including my own. But the only alternative to retrospective accounts is to write nothing: that is, to rely on the versions written at the time. This is not the place to review all the sources; suffice it to say that almost all are remarkably poor—Sale's book is still in a class by itself—and that the historical record should not be left to them by default. Many of the issues that concern me clarified themselves only after the fact; that is the way history happens; that is why historians are needed, not simply archivists. Some of the joys of this work erupted when I refigured: what happened was not what I thought was happening at the time it happened. Critical reflection on one's own experience is one of the sublime pleasures of the sociological imagination.

So SDS is at the center of my account. I have detoured only occasionally, for comparative purposes and where the facts were accessible, to local and regional movements like Berkeley's Free Speech Movement in 1964, the Vietnam Day Committee in 1965, and People's Park in 1969, or time-limited campaigns like the teach-in wave of 1965. I have not analyzed the antiwar movement as a whole, although, in Chapter 7, I have probed the rise of the National Moratorium in 1969, and its relation to the Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam ("Mobe"). These groups, along with the May 2nd Movement, the National Coordinating

Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and The Resistance, were essentially networks of organizers; none of them was a sustained membership organization. Nonetheless, my decidedly unsystematic but strong impression (somewhat confirmed in Part II) is that what I found to be true of the SDS-media relation would hold for the New Left as a whole: the media's framing devices were similar, as was the impact of the process on activists.

As for generalizations about other movements, I have hazarded some here and there in Parts II and III. When I undertook my research, I hoped—first ambitiously, then idly—to study the movement-media process for the black movement, the women's movement, and the environmental movement, as well as for the New Left. But early immersion in SDS sources quickly convinced me that the comparative task was unmanageable for a single researcher lacking co-workers or more lifetimes. I hope to see writers putting similar questions to the histories of SNCC (which I discuss in passing in Part II), the Southern Christian Leadership Council,[1] the Black Panther Party, and other black groups, as well as insurgent movements of other ethnic minorities, feminism, the environmental and consumer movements, pro- and anti-abortion movements, pro- and anti-busing movements, the Jarvis-Gann property tax revolt, and other reform and opposition movements.

THE MEDIA

I wanted to study "the media"; but which forms and which news organizations? Despite the claims of grand theory and of the former Vice-President of the United States, their coverage is not uniform and their significance is not identical.

I intended at first to study at least two television networks: the networks remain unique in their centralized symbolic force, their rise *in the sixties,* and their national reach. Certainly I wanted to study CBS News at least. CBS has been first or second in audience size, and in reputation, since the beginning of television news, averaging about 25 million viewers a night. In 1976, CBS's Evening News was broadcast by 205 local affiliates, NBC's by 195, and ABC's by 154. (ABC has gained since then because of its prime time success.) The CBS and NBC Evening News went from fifteen minutes to thirty in 1963, ABC News only in 1967. Since I wanted to

1. A start has been made by David J. Garrow in *Protest at Selma* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1978).

look at the *development* of network news through the sixties, and since ABC could not provide the fixed baseline of a news show constant in length, I eliminated it from the start, at least as my primary network. Between CBS and NBC, institutional policy made my decision for me. CBS would grant outside researchers limited access to their Newsfilm Archive, *which is the only archive even halfway open for news broadcasts made before August 1968* (when Vanderbilt University began videotaping all three networks' nightly news shows). NBC was closed to outsiders. So was ABC. I could not use their news even as secondary objects of comparison.

Deciding to examine CBS alone among the network news operations did not settle as much as I had hoped or had been led to expect. When I got to the CBS Newsfilm Archive in New York City, I found that it was impossible to find and to see—let alone to study—a large proportion of CBS News footage on the movement. Some material had been recorded on videotape, not on film, especially when it had been "fed" into the network from an out-of-town bureau; once the report had been transmitted, the tape had been reused and, in the process, wiped clean. If any copy was left in the world, it was the CBS "aircheck" copy, which CBS would not show. One would have to buy a copy to see it, I was told, and the cost was prohibitive. But more important, much film was simply lost. Some cardfile entries said that a film piece had been borrowed by a CBS News producer, or a documentary unit, or an auxiliary unit like *60 Minutes,* and lost by them, or kept there—in either event, never returned to the archive. Sometimes one day's coverage was there and the next day's was nowhere to be found, not even in the form of the audio track. When I checked with the separate audio tape archive, asking to hear the audio side of certain pieces, I was told: "We can only keep so much, because of space, so obviously somebody decided back then not to save these."

And even when the film existed in the archive, there were obstacles to comprehending it whole. Before 1966, most newsfilm was shot in black-and-white, and in these cases I was shown negative film—not easy to decipher. A further problem was that most newsfilm, whether black-and-white or color, was sent to New York and/or edited there on two (or sometimes three) separate reels, which were then broadcast simultaneously, superimposed on each other to make a complete image. (Usually, but not always, one reel played sound for some seconds while the other played picture; then they traded off.) When the reels were shown to me in the ar-

chive viewing room, it was almost always technically impossible to show the two reels simultaneously, as they had been broadcast; seeing them end to end, I probably lost some sense of the sight-and-sound wholes. Moreover, I saw only the film pieces, not the openings and closes supplied by the anchormen; before Vanderbilt University began videotaping network news in August 1968, no one saved those leads and closings. Finally, I was not permitted to see all the footage I succeeded in locating and asked to see. And because I could get an archive clerk assigned to me only briefly, I saw each news piece only once or twice. I took detailed notes, but it would surely have been better if I had been allowed to return to the clips in order to review them. The CBS Newsfilm Archive exists primarily for in-house use, and secondarily for sales to filmmakers. There is only a single viewing room. Evidently there are also union restrictions on the time of the projectionists. For all these reasons, I ended up deciding to study CBS's coverage, as best I could uncover it, alongside that of the *New York Times.*

But I have not let the irregularity of the CBS data divert me from discussing what there is to discuss. When a subject is important or intriguing enough, one studies it as best one can, with the best records available. If the data are not systematic, neither can the analysis be; but one still does not let the disappearance of some evidence decree one's historical subjects. In this case, if I could not see all the film I intended to see, I did have the compensatory advantage of reading the daily Editor's Logs for 1965 and subsequent years, which told me the subjects, locations, correspondents, and times for each news show's stories. I was able to get transcripts for *weekday* (not weekend) CBS News shows after March 1967 (when transcripts were first routinely kept), which provided the words but without any description of the pictures. And more important, I spoke at length and often more than once with a number of the CBS personnel involved in producing news reports of the movement (and other subjects) in the sixties. I spoke with correspondents, researchers, field producers (in charge of particular stories), and high-level producers on the Cronkite News. Thanks to cooperative CBS people, I was able to watch the Evening News operation in action, from both newsroom and control room; I also watched the editing process go on in an out-of-town bureau; soon I had a feel for the production process. Of course, I have watched unnumbered hours of television news, have reflected much upon its patterns, and have read the sociological and journalistic accounts recently published on the workings of CBS News and other news operations. Given the fact that the missing material is missing, I feel confident that my conclusions are as conclusive as possible.

As for the *New York Times,* it was the obvious choice for the study of the impact of newspaper coverage on a social movement. The *Times* has the best claim to be called *the* national newspaper and *the* newspaper of record. As a routine channel for governmental leads and the revelations "released" by one agency or another looking for outside support, it plays a variety of key roles in national decision-making.[2] Leon V. Sigal writes: "Because of their extensive readership among the politically influential, the *Times* and [Washington] *Post* function as something akin to house organs for the political elite."[3] The *Times* sets agendas, generating and certifying issues in government, business, intellectual, professional, and academic circles throughout the country.[4] As a syndicator of news and features, it purveys frames directly to many other daily newspapers around the country. But probably more important, journalists throughout the country believe the *Times* and believe *in* it. In 1962, according to one study, about 90 percent of all Washington correspondents read the *Times* and considered it "fair" and "reliable."[5] Thus the *Times* ends up influencing the content of wire service stories, TV and radio news, and newsmagazines.

The *Times* is, in fact, one of the main channels through which network news workers form pictures of the world, what is happening there, and what, within that world, deserves investigating. At CBS News, decision-makers regularly clip the *Times* for leads

2. See Thomas Bethell, "The Myth of an Adversary Press," *Harper's Magazine,* January 1977, pp. 33–40.

3. Leon V. Sigal, *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1973), p. 47.

4. Periodically the *Times*'s Sunday Business Section runs full-page ads in which corporation executives testify to the indispensability of the *Times.* For example, note this quotation from Robert E. Kirby, Chairman of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, on March 28, 1976: "While I sometimes find it difficult to agree with the *Times,* I find it equally difficult to get along without the *Times.* To manage a business—particularly a complicated business—requires information. I, for one, can't afford to pass it up." At the bottom of the page, each ad ends: "*The New York Times*: Makes things happen where affluence and influence meet."

As for elite intellectuals, Charles Kadushin (in *The American Intellectual Elite* [Boston: Little, Brown, 1974], pp. 140–141) points out that "*The New York Times* was read literally by 98 percent of our sample." With regard to Vietnam: "The editorial pages were not as important as the news itself. . . . *The New York Times* had a very important role in aligning intellectuals against the war in Vietnam."

5. William L. Rivers, "The Correspondents after 25 Years," *Columbia Journalism Review* 1 (Spring 1962): 8, cited in Sigal, *Reporters and Officials,* p. 40.

to stories. During a research visit to New York City in November 1976, I noticed that, one night, CBS and NBC News each broadcast a reasonably thorough piece on union organizing drives in the South. When I asked a CBS producer to explain what seemed an odd coincidence, he replied immediately that the *Times* had run a piece on the Southern organizing campaign the previous Sunday, and confirmed that CBS commonly followed the *Times*'s lead. Another informant pointed out that *Times* reporting can certify reality decisively when network news is itself divided on an issue. In the mid-sixties, a CBS researcher "had developed close ties with [District Attorney] Jim Garrison in New Orleans, and had some interesting information [about Garrison's investigation of the Kennedy assassination]. . . . His material was all rejected. Mike Wallace was in New Orleans covering an American Legion convention when the [New Orleans] *Times-Picayune* broke the story about the Garrison information. And so they had talent down there, they had the information, the local paper had written the information, and CBS had a scoop against the other networks. They did a piece and Cronkite wouldn't take it. The next morning, the *New York Times* had it, and then they used it. They had a lack of journalistic self-confidence. Maybe fear of provoking the powers that be."[6] Not doing much original reporting, and without any research staff to speak of, CBS assigns to the *Times*—along with the Associated Press and United Press International—the role of gatekeeper and certifier of new reality.

The networks are hardly alone, of course, in according the *Times* the prestige it courts. The *Times* is unabashed about aiming for greatness; with the country's largest staff of reporters, both at home and abroad, it can come close to making its reputation as "newspaper of record" stick. And of no small importance to this study, the leadership of the New Left took the *Times* quite seriously indeed, and not just in the New York area. In Cambridge, Massachusetts, in the early sixties, and in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in 1963–65, SDS leaders read the paper avidly, studying it for political straws in the wind. Even in the San Francisco Bay Area, late in 1965, two SDS organizers lamented: "On the West Coast, it is said you have to read the *New York Times* to find out what SDS is doing nationally."[7] Their ironic lament contained an indisputable truth.

6. Interview, Michael Nolan, December 28, 1976. Nolan was assistant to the assignment editor at CBS News.

7. Roy Dahlberg and Carolyn Craven, untitled paper for SDS December Conference, n.d. [December 1965]; author's file.

Accordingly, I searched—with the invaluable help of Glenn Hirsch—through microfilm archives of the *Times* for 1965–70, paying deepest attention to stories about SDS in particular, but noting also coverage of other radical and antiwar activity. On occasion, for comparative purposes, I looked at other papers' coverage of events reported in the *Times*. In my historical accounts of movement–media relations, however, especially for 1965, I concentrate on the *New York Times* coverage—partly because of its intrinsic importance in setting national political agendas, partly because of its agenda-setting function for other media, and partly because of its accessibility—or at least the accessibility of its Late City Edition, the one that gets microfilmed. I do think, however, that it would be edifying to scrutinize other major metropolitan dailies (and the wire services and newsmagazines) over the same period. Without further study, not too much should be extrapolated from the example, however powerful, of the *New York Times*. In 1977, a *Los Angeles Times* reporter found that over a five-month period, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Los Angeles Times* rarely agreed on the most important story of the day. One-fifth of the time there was not a single story that appeared on the front page of all three papers.[8]

Comparing CBS News and the *New York Times* turned out to be revelatory in one way I had not at all expected. I had started out with the assumption that many of the framing mechanisms that concerned me were peculiar to television, in degree if not altogether in kind. It is a commonplace that television compresses and oversimplifies the news, lends itself to symbolic condensations, and turns itself over to good pictures at the cost of narrative complexity. None of this is untrue. But I discovered to my surprise that the *Times*'s and CBS's frames for covering the movement were not so different after all, that roughly the same analytic model could be brought to bear on both television and newspapers, and that, at least with respect to the New Left, CBS had nothing in particular to be ashamed of. Journalists and media executives as well as scholars usually presume that print and TV news are substantially different in tone, techniques, content, and impact; the same factors are trotted out defensively by both newspaper people (there are things we can do that television can't, so we're indispensable) and television people (there are things newspapers can do that we can't, so don't

8. David Shaw, "Page 1 News: Press Rarely in Agreement," *Los Angeles Times*, June 24, 1977.

expect too much of us).[9] On the one side, there is newspapers' "depth," their "investigations," and their greater capacity to relay information; on the other, there is TV's "immediacy," its "credibility" and "emotional impact," and its "accessibility." It may be that the two media are converging as newspapers lose circulation and scramble for a suburbanized audience which is, in turn, conditioned by two decades of television.[10] But it remains important to study variations among media (not only networks and newspapers but, importantly, wire services, radio, and local television) and among distinct institutions within a single medium.

I have tried to be precise about variations as well as similarities in frames and journalistic procedures. But I cannot resist the conclusion that although different news organizations may have employed the various framing devices with greater or lesser frequency, the overall *repertory* of frames was standard and remains standard. The forms of distortion are essentially the same from newspaper to newspaper, and (despite the rivalrous claims of difference made by both sides) between major newspapers and networks. My impression of newsmagazine and wire service coverage is that, by and large, they select from the same repertory.[11] If there *are* differences, the *New York Times* and CBS News may have differed from other media institutions principally in the *range* of their frames—at times respecting movements, at times trivializing them, at times attributing menace to them—and in the relative contradictoriness and complexity of their stories. Certainly differences in treatment are important, from the CBS network to a local station, from the *New York Times* to the *San Diego Union*, from

9. See Paul Weaver's clear statement about similarities and differences, "Newspaper News and Television News," in Douglass Cater and Richard Adler, eds., *Television as a Social Force: New Approaches to TV Criticism* (New York: Praeger, 1975), pp. 81–94. Perhaps inadvertently, Weaver shows the similarities to be considerably more striking than the differences. Differences that remain salient include (1) the TV anchor's or correspondent's great claim to omniscience because he or she appears "in person," and (2) TV's preference for "good film," other things being equal. But the second difference may be shrinking as newspapers gravitate back to heavier use of photos and sensational reports.

10. An early survey of the new suburbanized metropolitan paper, with its indulgence in "lifestyle," personality, and news "briefs," is Fergus M. Bordewich's "Supermarketing the Newspaper," *Columbia Journalism Review* 16 (September–October 1977): 23–30. The phenomenon is recent enough to have passed without much comment to date.

11. But researchers take note: according to Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester ("Accidental News," *American Journal of Sociology* 81 [September 1975]: 240n.), the wire services keep their copy only three years, and do not index it.

the *New York Daily News* to the *Chicago Daily News*. But in large measure these are variations on the same themes, within a hegemonic whole.

ON ANALYZING NEWS

A few notes about the news stories I chose to present in Part I, and how I went about looking at them:

I detailed coverage of the New Left in 1965 because the major frames were set in place then; that was the year in which the "New Left" went on the media agenda. By looking closely at that coverage, we can discover the original frames and watch them hardening into the taken-for-granted conventional wisdom, the hegemonic definitions of how things are.

I decided to exploit the fact that there are few enough recoverable *Times* and CBS News items for that year to permit a readable analysis of all of them, piece by piece. The risk was a certain repetition in the narrative, but I decided that it was more important to give the reader a chance to see the whole framing process unfold in a year of coverage. At least I know that the uncertainties in my analysis are inherent in cultural exegesis itself, not in my sampling procedure.

I also had theoretical reasons for preferring the qualitative, exhaustive approach to news history. I wanted the suppleness of the qualitative "literary" approach to cultural artifacts, whether newspaper articles, TV pieces, comic books, or museum pieces. I wanted to "tease out" those determining but hidden assumptions which in their unique ordering remain opaque to quantitative content analysis. At its best, qualitative analysis is more flexible than the quantitative kind; it aspires to a level of complexity (I do not claim it is bound to achieve it) that remains true to the actual complexity and contradictoriness of media artifacts.

As Stuart Hall points out, both qualitative and quantitative methodologies begin with "a long preliminary soak" in the materials.[12] The question is then whether to identify countable categories and to investigate the patterns of their recurrence, or to use "the preliminary reading to select representative examples which

12. My discussion of qualitative methodology is heavily indebted to Stuart Hall's treatment of these matters in his Introduction to *Paper Voices: The Popular Press and Social Change, 1935–1965*, by A. C. H. Smith with Elizabeth Immirzi and Trevor Blackwell (London: Chatto and Windus, 1975), pp. 11–24, especially pp. 14–17. The quotation is from p. 15.

can be more intensively analysed."[13] I chose both methods: to identify key categories of content, and also to analyze examples of news treatment selected for their political significance. What I did *not* do was to count instances of recurrent themes: (a) partly because I could not locate some network pieces; (b) more importantly, because much of the subtlety I find interesting would probably be lost in quantitative sieves; and (c) still more importantly, because I wanted to analyze news coverage especially at crucial—that is to say, atypical—political moments. The criteria for selecting those moments had to be brought to the news material from without, from a larger sense of political process. Again, this is not simply a study of the content of media versions of the New Left to demonstrate distortion, but a study of the political significance of those versions, both as revelations of the politics of media institutions and as influences upon the movement itself.

It needs to be said, I suppose, that the "literary" choice emphatically does not amount to a choice of the intuitive against the objective. Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies rely on preliminary interrogations of the material, interrogations which proceed, at least implicitly, from "intuitive" assumptions about what *matters* in the content, what needs to be either analyzed or counted. The contrasts between the two methodologies in their pure forms are of a different order, as Stuart Hall nicely argues:

> The error is to assume that because content analysis uses precise criteria for coding evidence it is therefore objective in the literal sense of the term: and because literary/linguistic analysis steers clear of code-building it is merely intuitive and unreliable. Literary/linguistic types of analysis also employ evidence: they point, in detail, to the text on which an interpretation of latent meaning is based; they indicate more briefly the fuller supporting or contextual evidence which lies to hand; they take into account material which modifies or disproves the hypotheses which are emerging; and they *should* (they do not always) indicate in detail why one rather than another reading of the material seems to the analyst the most plausible way of understanding it. Content analysis assumes repetition—the pile-up of material under one of the categories—to be the most useful indicator of significance.
>
> Literary/linguistic and stylistic analysis also employs recurrence as one critical dimension of significance, though these recurring patterns may not be expressed in quantifiable terms. . . . These recurring patterns are taken as pointers to latent meanings from which inferences as to the source can be drawn. But the literary/linguistic analyst has another string to his bow: namely, strategies for noting and taking account of emphasis. Position, placing, treatment, tone, stylistic intensification, striking imagery, etc., are all ways of registering emphasis. The really significant item may not be the one which continually recurs, but the one which stands out as an exception from the general pattern—but which is *also* given, in its exceptional context, the greatest weight.[14]

None of which is to say that quantitative techniques have no use in studies of media content. If they are harnessed to the qualitative approach, and if (no mean practical consideration) sufficiently inclusive materials are at hand, quantitative methods could shed some light on the surface content of news. They would not alert the student to, say, the significance of a *New York Times* reporter's mention of "warm spring sunshine" in a story about an antiwar demonstration (see Chapter 2, above), though they could tell us how often this sort of framing takes place in different types of news stories. In any event, it is late in the day for methodological exclusivity; in the act of interpretation and criticism, the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.