

https://dspace.org/

Changing understandings of fame in SA weekly magazines over the 20th century: from Huisgenoot to Heat

Kok, Joey

2018
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/26492

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

CHANGING UNDERSTANDINGS OF FAME IN SA WEEKLY MAGAZINES OVER THE 20TH CENTURY: FROM *HUISGENOOT* TO *HEAT*

By Joey Kok

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy by dissertation of the University of the Witwatersrand in Journalism and Media Studies.

Johannesburg, October 2018

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Doctorate in Philosophy in the Department of Journalism, at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination at any other university.



19th of October 2018

Dedication

To Berno and Sebastian. You are my stars.

Acknowledgements

I could not have embarked on or completed this project without the support and guidance from my supervisor, Professor Susan van Zyl. A big thank you also to each and every person – family, friends, colleagues current and former, the library and support staff at Wits – who has helped me search, think and question, freed up time, offered advice, extra reading material, pointers, a willing ear, a shoulder to lean (or sometimes cry) on and the odd cup of coffee or glass of wine. You all really pulled me through, and I will forever be grateful for such a community.

Contents

Introduction 7

Chapter 1: The *Epic Hero* in *Huisgenoot* in the early 20th century 21

1.1 Early Huisgenoot's Epic Heroes 23

1.2 Paul Kruger: Afrikaner Epic Hero 40

Conclusion 50

Chapter 2: The *Star* rises in South Africa: *Drum* magazine in the 1950s 56

2.1 Stardom the Drum way 60

2.2 Dolly Rathebe: "Just about Africa's most famous and exciting woman" 75

Conclusion 82

Chapter 3: *Emerging Celebrity*: *Star*, Celebrity and the space between: *People* SA in the late 1980s 85

3.1 Emerging Celebrity unpacked 95

3.2 Barbra Streisand does Emerging Celebrity 116

Conclusion 120

Chapter 4: *Celebrity Proper*: *heat SA* in the early 21st century 122

4.1 Uncovering the Celebrity Proper 129

4.2 Producing the Celebrity Proper 140

Conclusion 157

Chapter 5: The *Figure Now* 161

5.1 Dispersal and hybridity in The Figure Now 162

5.2 Drawing the line at 'real' illness 174

5.3 The Hero returns, but not in epic form 183

Conclusion 187

Concluding reflection 189

Bibliography 199

Introduction

The South African version of weekly British 'celebrity' magazine *heat* was launched in May 2004, and I joined the team in December of that year, as the chief copy editor. I was a full-time *heat* SA staff member for the title for three years, and also worked there in a regular freelance capacity thereafter. I held a number of senior positions, including acting deputy editor and managing editor. In the process I became familiar with the news-selection, or 'copy-tasting' process, amongst other things, and ultimately became interested in what appeared to me to be a growing focus on scandal and what were portrayed as physical flaws.

The scandals included photographic exposés of entertainers, mostly from the Hollywood film industry, behaving outrageously in their private capacity but often in public too, in many cases because they had apparently been drinking too much or taking 'illegal substances'. The 'defects' the magazine regularly revealed, again through photographic evidence, were most often physical ones, including cellulite and 'bad skin', as well as questionable judgment, especially in terms of fashion.

Moreover, *heat* had a very specific and unique editorial voice, an ironic, tongue-in-cheek, irreverent tone that, crucially, appeared to celebrate its own focus on scandal and personal imperfection in representing the entertainer.

It was also the only local magazine that had a 100-percent entertainment-personality focus; from its advertising and promotional pages to staple magazine features such as news, fashion, beauty and even horoscopes: every section or element of the magazine had some form of entertainment-personality coverage as its hook.

With its idiosyncratic approach, and the distinctive entertainer figure that emerged in the coverage, the magazine did extremely well in its fledgling years, selling more than 100 000 copies in a week on occasion, a significant number for the local market. *heat* SA's entry also caused a considerable frisson in the local weekly-magazine market. *People* SA, arguably *heat*'s closest competitor, switched its frequency from bi-monthly to weekly to coincide with the launch of *heat* SA. In addition, following the *heat* launch, two new local weekly magazines with entertainment content were established: *Move!*, in 2005, and *Mense*, an Afrikaans-language edition of *People* SA, in 2006.

Moreover, like its parent brand in the United Kingdom, *heat* SA also appeared to be a trendsetter among the weekly magazines in terms of its strong focus on scandal and imperfection. Besides the already-mentioned *Move!*, *People* and *Mense*, the other weeklies included the almost century-year-old brand *Huisgenoot* and its two English-language stable-mates, *YOU* and *Drum*. Badly behaved entertainers started appearing more frequently and in more prominent positions within these titles. In keeping with international trends at the time, scandal could be argued to have considerably boosted the sales of South African weeklies in the early years of the 21st century. All these apparent shifts in entertainment news, both on the local and international print-media landscape, were interesting, and could be read as providing an indication of the way in which magazines approached or represented fame was changing.

Yet, despite a general shift in the weekly magazine industry in the first decade of the 21st century towards greater inclusion of notions of scandal and physical imperfection in its coverage of entertainment personalities, clear distinctions could still be drawn between the nature of the content produced by the main competing titles or brands on the local landscape. As *heat* SA staff members, we critically examined and analysed our local competition on a weekly basis in an attempt to accurately predict how these titles would be covering the week's entertainment-personality news, in order to distinguish ourselves by means of unique coverage, thereby piquing reader interest and, hopefully, sales.

As we compared titles, we started noticing how they set themselves apart by following distinctive formulas. *Huisgenoot* (the title can loosely be translated as 'home companion'), the oldest and also biggest of the brands in terms of circulation, for instance, always seemed to honour its family-magazine heritage by treating scandalous content with restraint. Its English-medium stable-mates, *YOU* and *Drum*, aimed at middle-class white and black readerships respectively, followed suit. *People* SA and its Afrikaans edition, *Mense*, appeared to mimic *heat* in some ways by distinguishing themselves from the exclusively positive entertainment-personality news formula of the eponymous American brand by including elements of scandal and also increasingly exposing physical 'imperfection' in the supposedly beautiful. Aimed at an aspiring middle-class black readership, *Move!*'s entertainment news section also had a preference for scandal stories.

As we analysed the various magazines' distinct editorial offerings and witnessed what appeared to be readers' growing appetite for entertainment-personality scandal, I became curious as to how it had all emerged and changed to culminate in *heat*'s specific

representation of fame. And so the idea for this PhD topic was ignited, a project focused on tracing back what, in weekly magazines, came before the type of figure that emerged in *heat* SA's coverage during the early years of the 21st century and on documenting subsequent transformations. All *heat* SA's competitors had been on the market for more than a decade, and *Huisgenoot* almost a century, and an opportunity was identified to follow any possible shifts in how fame was represented in these magazines over time, reflecting on local magazine history while tracing the people covered in these titles. I found myself in the position, not only of being part of the team producing the coverage in *heat* SA and critically reflecting on what we and our competitors were doing at the time in terms of representing fame, but also of going back almost a century into the archives of *Huisgenoot* and examining which people they had covered and how they had covered them.

Not only did I look back, however. A substantial part of this thesis had already been written when *heat* SA closed down, and suddenly there was no longer a weekly, pure 'celebrity'-news magazine in the country. This presented an opportunity to 'gaze ahead' by further extending the analysis to include any possible shifts in understandings of fame that could be traced in the remaining magazines following the closure of *heat* SA.

The thesis took shape as research into coverage, focusing on how weekly magazines conceived of the figures they covered, how their coverage of people changed over time, and as a result how the idea of 'fame', as represented in magazines, seemed to shift – as did the type of figure that was represented.

In tracing the shifts in coverage, attention was paid to the changes in the nature, content and style of weekly magazines' formulae around famous figures across the 20th century. While looking through the coverage, a number of specific elements were taken into consideration. Firstly, there was the *selection* of characters, thus looking at who was covered and also why they were covered. It was difficult to find an appropriate term for *why* people were covered, for their 'representation-worthiness'. Most often, these people warranted coverage on account of what it was that they did for a living or their public actions. The changes in the reasons for being famous in the first place, interesting or worthy of representation in the editorial offering or the magazine's selection of characters to cover, formed the basis of the discussion.

Crucially, shifts were also traced in terms of the changes in characteristics or traits the magazines emphasised and/or chose to ignore in their coverage of people who were selected for inclusion. This selection of traits or characteristics is part of how magazines

could be said to cover or re-present the group of already known personalities selected for inclusion.

Thirdly, there was some consideration of the *way* in which the coverage was executed changed over time. Changes were noted in how the magazines seemed to represent 'well-knownness' in terms of page and word counts dedicated to coverage of an individual person. Not only did it concern page counts, words and images, how these individual elements were used in the representation was also examined. In other words, the particular style of coverage was observed and also how this changed over time. These observations were used to support the different understandings of fame that seemed to emerge from the textual evidence.

This is essentially what transpired during the analysis of the material gathered for this project. Changes in coverage or representation over time were sometimes subtle and sometimes more pronounced. But they were significant enough to make it possible to convincingly argue for varied understandings of fame to surface, or different kinds of dominant famous figures to emerge. Hence I saw myself, in a way, answering to the following challenge: setting out a 'taxonomy' of understandings of fame, a categorisation of sorts, based primarily on weekly magazine coverage.

This is not the first proposed categorisation of fame. However, as this is in part a media studies project, the hope is that it will contribute to the existing body of knowledge in terms of a specialised focus on South African weekly magazines, and in particular the broad understandings of well-knownness suggested by their coverage, of people over the 20th century. It might seem somewhat singular to specifically focus on definitions of fame in reading the coverage, but the shifts in notions of well-knownness that seem to justify a categorisation are admittedly systematic, fitting into international magazine publishing trends, which in turn form part of the constantly changing socio-cultural landscape, and general understandings of fame.

It is important to emphasise this project as being an examination of changing notions of fame as apparent in weekly magazines in South Africa over the 20th century and into the 21st. I specifically reiterate this point about the focus of this project being fame as witnessed in magazine coverage, and in South Africa, as the general history of fame of course stretches back much further than the 20th century. This history also encompasses or relies on a variety of media; compared to older media such as coins, busts and portraits, magazines are a relatively new medium to disseminate and circulate individual fame.

Yet although it is relatively new as a fame-disseminating medium, the magazine in general can be said to subscribe in its coverage to understandings of fame that precede its commercialisation; in other words, magazines select people who might already be famous for coverage, or cover people for the same characteristics for which they might have gained fame in preceding centuries.

In addition it is crucial to note that some of the defining characteristics of the key figures in the categorisation I am proposing here emerge in earlier representations of fame; the idea of scandal, for instance, might arguably only start appearing in magazine coverage from the middle of the 20th century onwards, and only become dominant in this medium towards the end of the century, but that is not to say that scandal and transgression are absent from the general history of fame. On the contrary, from great lovers to brazen train robbers, there are countless examples of people who became famous well before the 20th century specifically for behaviour that was considered to be on the continuum of transgression and could be described as anything from risqué to criminal.

South Africa seems to follow the broad international magazine trends, yet the evidence that was gathered revealed certain South African idiosyncrasies. Subsequently, there was an examination of how the process of localising coverage, adapting it to suit the tastes and preferences of the targeted domestic readership, seemed to take advantage of specific notions that the literature identifies as underlying constructions of fame.

While the main focus of the research is on the coverage itself, the analysis has also attempted to contextualise the shifts in terms of local and global media and publishing trends as well as relevant social, cultural and historical factors influencing magazine coverage and representations of fame, particularly in South Africa.

In picking out the dominant forms of fame for analysis from the magazine coverage over time, the aim is to go beyond a mere categorisation by arguing that there is some kind of continuity of 'personality traits', a notion of cumulativeness and lineage in the successive understandings of fame. With no one understanding of fame falling completely away, the project could be described as a kind of genealogy of fame over the 20th century and into the 21st.

A set of questions guided the original process of gathering the evidence. Specifically, there was an attempt at tracing the emergence of the first understanding of fame in South African magazine coverage and analyse the form this coverage took. Consequently, the shifts in

coverage over time could be traced, identified and analysed, resulting in a timeline or trajectory of successive magazine understandings of fame, and a kind of line-up of figures embodying these changing understandings.

Put differently, the analysis seemed to reveal relatively distinctive or dominant understandings of fame that broadly appeared to correspond with specific time periods stretching across a few decades each over the 20th century. In other words, the process involved periodisation. Although it greatly facilitates analysis, it should, of course, be noted that periodisation, as the idea of categorising the past into distinct and measured 'chunks' of time, is a risky enterprise that constantly invites redefinition, as there are often exceptions, and the periods overlap. Similarly, there were also exceptions and overlapping between the identified categories as the century progressed. These pitfalls of categorisation and periodisation are, to some extent, mitigated by the fact that the research focused on the *dominant* understandings of fame during broad time periods and took into account other understandings that are there, but do not emerge as strongly.

The textual evidence was drawn from weekly magazines (or titles that would eventually become weeklies), partly because this publishing frequency had become so closely associated with the idea of entertainment news by the 21st century. All the local weekly magazines with relevant content were initially considered for inclusion. 'Relevant content' refers to a preference for coverage of people and personalities instead of specific subject matter, hence the exclusion of magazines including *Farmer's Weekly*, *Landbouweekblad*, *Scope* and the weekly financial titles. The selection of magazines eventually consulted was, in part, influenced by the availability of archival copies. Access to archival copies of weeklies that were no longer published, such as *Outspan* and its successor *Personality*, was limited, for instance.

As a first step in the research process, material was gathered from a few randomly selected issues per year of each of the titles considered. A preliminary analysis of the coverage was conducted in order to identify possible broad trends running across all titles, as well as significant exceptions. While the trajectory of fame seemed to unfold in a roughly similar way across all magazine titles from which material was drawn for analysis, going into the 21st century, four successive figures dominated the trajectory, across four different locally produced titles during specific time periods: *Huisgenoot* in the early 19th century, *Drum* in the 1950s, *People* SA in the 1980s and *heat* SA in the early 2000s. Access to the archives of these titles was gained through the libraries of the University of the Witwatersrand in

Johannesburg, the Bailey's African History Archives and the collections of the relevant magazine publishers, namely Media24 and Caxton.

Once the trajectory and the relevant magazine titles through which each of the four figures would be explored had been established, the evidence gathered from selected issues during the initial research process were analysed in-depth. This archival material was supplemented with additional articles drawn from the launch issue of each of the selected magazine titles as well as other randomly selected issues published in the first decade of each magazine's existence. The evident trends were positioned within the broader social, historical and cultural context in South Africa and also, where relevant, to the international publishing environment.

As the new millennium moved towards its third decade, however, and an attempt was made to analyse a post-*heat* understanding of fame as it was unfolding, it seemed clear no distinctive fifth figure emerged in the coverage. Instead, there seemed to be indications of attrition. And, in addition, one could pick out individual characteristics in the coverage that were familiar, as they were typical of some of the existing figures in the trajectory. With this next understanding of fame arguably not taking on any specifically new dimensions, there was also no one magazine title 'leading the way', as had been the case in the trajectory up until this point.

With the trajectory unfolding chronologically, the chapter division below is guided respectively by the four main figures that appeared to dominate magazine coverage over the 20th century and into the 21st, plus a discussion of the unfolding post-*heat* understanding of fame, which reveals the absence of the capacity to categorise with any clarity.

Chapter 1 recognises an early 20th-century preference in the magazine industry, both locally and internationally, for the inclusion in editorial selection of people reminiscent in some ways of the protagonists of the epic poetry of Homer and his contemporaries. By extension, this category excludes the kind of people dominating magazine representations of fame by the end of the century. Hence, firstly, the occurrence of pioneers and soldiers and others who fit the broad definition of the heroic in one way or another. And then, secondly, an emphasis on traits that support this narrative: exemplariness, bravery, selflessness, moral strength and fibre, courage, humility and so forth – all applied in public life and for the common good.

In addition, this first chapter aims to show how this early 20th-century representation of fame in South African magazines is a simple form of what might be a re-presentation of an already established epic heroic image. The term *Epic Hero*[1] was selected to represent this category of fame here, and when it is rendered in italics and with initial capital letters, it signals that it embodies the characteristics described and discussed in Chapter 1.

The chapter also explores how, at this point, the magazine's selection of people and the coverage itself seemed to assume the readers' almost exclusive interest in people, that shared their values. The chapter points out how those considered worthy of representation in the magazines are presented as ideal and exemplary, suggesting that they have *earned* the readership's loyalty, commitment and devotion.

It reflects on how the figure of what is called the *Epic Hero* finds resonance among the fledgling Afrikaner nation in South Africa by referring to coverage selected from very early issues of *De Huisgenoot*, which was first published in 1916. Early *Huisgenoot* selected the people it covered from the ranks of (mostly) men who had contributed, in various ways, to the birth and continued development of the Afrikaner nation. The majority of these men had already achieved a kind of *Epic Hero* status of their own making before the magazine was founded; in fact, most of the people who were covered in early issues of *Huisgenoot* were dead by the time the magazine launched. *Huisgenoot* merely perpetuated and augmented the image these figures already held in the collective imaginary of the Afrikaner readership by shaping their stories to fit a magazine version of the *Epic Hero*. Early *Huisgenoot* coverage takes the form of lengthy and wordy hagiographies containing many examples of epic heroic and selfless deeds and participation in events of cardinal importance to the Afrikaner culture and nation, not least of which is the 19th-century *Groot Trek* (Great Trek), which can be seen to echo Homer's *Odyssey*.

With specific reference to the late president of the South African Republic Paul Kruger, the chapter discusses how coverage surfacing the *Epic Hero* figure almost exclusively celebrated his public actions that were often presented as being extraordinary, and drew him as an exemplary person worth emulating. The chapter also alludes to how the notion of 'setting an example', which surfaced strongly in early *Huisgenoot* articles, fitted into the Afrikaner-nationalist project of the time.

[1] This convention of italicisation and initial capitalisation is followed throughout the thesis for the terms used for all the individual figures in the trajectory to indicate that they represent the specific set of characteristics identified for each of the categories.

Elements of the Hero[2] would continue to characterise the magazine representations of fame, albeit, crucially, without the epic dimension. We might still sometimes witness brief, unusual and unexpected additions to the heroic cannon. Yet the Hero slowly made way for what seemed to be a very different figure, selected for editorial inclusion solely on the basis of existing fame in the entertainment business.

Chapter 2 unpacks this new perception of fame, commonly known as stardom, showing how it distinguished itself from its predecessor. This distinction concerns not only the professions of people selected for the editorial offering, which now include entertainment personalities as opposed to the earlier pastors, poets and politicians, but also the exposure of both private *and* public space and activity.

The chapter also locates the first steps in the shift in magazine coverage from a re-representation of an existing understanding of fame to a more active co-producing role. It does so by reminding us how, ever since entertainers first started becoming well- and widely known figures in the early 20th century, thereby disrupting the 'pantheon of Heroes' that came before, magazines have been one of the most important media to circulate information about them.

But the chapter also identifies characteristics shared by the first two magazine representations of fame in the 20th century, notably a continued reliance on readership devotion to or admiration for the famous figure in addition to, or perhaps based on, an apparent continuing emphasis on an element of extraordinariness. The chapter also engages with this 'extraordinariness' and its meaning within the notion of stardom, notably how it shifts to start incorporating the idea of visual qualities such as glamour and 'radiance'.

The chapter uncovers the cachet this figure had for the mainly black readership of the 1950s South African magazine, *Drum*, which may, at first, seem an unusual choice for the exploration of stardom, with its historical origins in the overwhelmingly white early Hollywood moving-pictures industry. Yet the chapter attempts to show that the *Star* figure that emerges in the pages of *Drum* through an early form of 'new journalism' practised in a very specific location in Johannesburg, and specifically the coverage of local songstress and

[2] To indicate that this term is used to indicate broader understandings of the heroic without an epic dimension, and thus not a separate understanding of fame analysed in this project, it is simply rendered with an initial capital and without the italicisation. This convention is also followed throughout.

film actor Dolly Rathebe, who is sketched as extraordinarily glamorous and gifted, is just too compelling to overlook.

Towards the end of the century, however, pure glamour begins to lose ground to the idea of flaw in the way well-knownness was portrayed in magazines. We see the first tentative suggestions of a kind of fame that is not embodied in people who are generally admired, like the *Epic Hero* and the *Star*. Rather, we see a move away from the ongoing representation of what might be considered perfect and ideal, and in its place the inclusion of the notion of the imperfect, problematic or tainted in some way. So while we see the same entertainers being selected for inclusion in the coverage, the focus of the articles moves towards revealing imperfection instead of focusing on perfection. This transitional figure remains a *Star*, yet prepares us for the more radically 'flawed' entertainer that originally led to my interest in this project.

Chapter 3 is devoted to this transitional figure, which paves the way for a more complex and established form in the 21st century, hence the decision to name this category in the trajectory *Emerging Celebrity*. This chapter points to the increasing absence of the heroic and the diminishing appearance of the admirable in magazine representations of fame towards the end of the 20th century.

It identifies the figure that slowly comes take its place alongside the all-glamorous *Star* and the few remaining epic moments in magazine coverage, as one that is less exemplary, less admirable, less revered and in some cases more tragic.

The chapter traces what can be construed as a kind of secular 'fall from grace' of the famous figure towards the end of the 20th century, specifically in terms of behaviour displayed in private life, an aspect that is also given increasing exposure in magazine coverage, often at the expense of publicising the public image. The chapter also attempts to show how there is not only a shift towards coverage or perhaps exposure of the private existence of entertainers but also the first indications of a movement purporting to uncover the inner psychological life of these performers. This latter movement, of uncovering or exposing an emotional life, is a crucial one, specifically because it appears to have a significant influence on the disappearance of an epic dimension in the rare coverage surfacing the heroic.

By engaging with all these aspects in the coverage, the chapter attempts to show how the readership seems to veer from admiration and devotion to something more complex towards the end of the century. Readers' expectations seemed to include the desire to be

entertained but also, crucially, to be shocked and, ultimately, reminded of the possibly imperfect and thus 'real' selves of the entertainers. This chapter also demonstrates how late 20th-century readership expectation to be scandalised and also to see authenticity was fulfilled by the magazines' increasing turn to the notion of the imperfect, especially in terms of failed romantic relationships, as well as misbehaviour in the private realm, often through excessive and conspicuous consumption of products legal and illegal.

The focus on certain kinds of personal failure and imperfection that distinguished late 20th-century magazine representation of fame from its predecessors is examined in order to demonstrate in what ways they are used to reinforce both the ordinariness and extraordinariness that have by now come to characterise the construction of the entertainment figure.

As with preceding chapters, Chapter 3 takes into account the secondary literature, which attributes the emergence of the notion of scandal in magazine coverage of entertainment personalities to the decline, from the middle of the century, of the so-called Hollywood studio system, which commercialised the figure of the *Star*. It is noted here how this development in the global film world appears to have been the catalyst for magazines becoming ever more complicit in the process of *producing* the famous figure. The chapter attempts to surface how, towards the end of the century, given the film studios' reported loss of control over the entertainer image, magazines arguably had more freedom in terms of material that could be considered for inclusion in coverage. By introducing the idea of scandal (to meet what magazines understood to be reader expectation), this chapter makes the key argument that these magazines suddenly, and perhaps somewhat inadvertently, found themselves becoming architects, instead of mere producers executing film studio orders, as they had been before, of the entertainer image.

All of these shifts are explored in this chapter with reference to the local edition of *People* magazine in the 1980s, which appears to have deviated, since its launch, from the predominantly scandal-free formula of its eponymous title in the United States. Given the argument that, towards the end of the century, an element of scandal came to occupy an ever more prominent part in the magazine representation of fame, this deviation is an interesting and important one and a main reason *People* magazine was selected.

And then there was what I have called the *Celebrity Proper*, the early 21st-century figure that first ignited my interest. Using coverage from the local franchise of *heat*, a more established and complex, and sometimes even arguably radicalised, form of fame is

explored in Chapter 4, which argues that early 21st-century magazine representations of fame revolved around visual (photographic) exposure of scandal, now almost exclusively in the private life, with public life details merely hinted at or prior reader knowledge assumed.

The chapter shows that the early 21st-century representation was, in addition, based on visual exposure of what was often presented as physical imperfection. It was a figure constructed around visual evidence of imperfection, both in terms of behaviour, almost exclusively in private, and of the body.

Following on from the more rudimentary *Emerging Celebrity* of Chapter 3, Chapter 4 specifically emphasises the development, modulation and even sometimes radicalisation of notions that first started emerging in late 20th-century representations of fame, including the ever-changing possibilities for the interpretation of the ordinary–extraordinary divide and the idea of a continuous and apparently deeper penetration of the private realm. The private realm refers to the home or domestic space, but could also be extended to the private spaces of the body and, crucially, even to the inner private emotional life of the entertainer. This emotional life, the chapter argues, is explored even more consistently and relentlessly in the new millennium compared to late 20th-century coverage.

Drawing primarily on the coverage itself but also on personal exposure to the Celebrity[3]-media industry, the chapter continues to trace the ever more active participation of magazines in the production of the early 21st-century entertainment figure, with specific reference to how the weekly frequency arguably contributed to and possibly produced a very particular kind of figure and understanding of fame.

As the first decade of the new millennium drew to a close, however, higher-frequency media, and in particular social media, arguably became a real threat to the by-now traditional weekly Celebrity-news magazines. With most entertainers opting to have personal social-media accounts, they could be seen to reclaim their position as producers of their own image and relegated the weekly gossip magazines to essentially becoming consumers and, in a sense, re-presenters of pre-defined fame once again.

In South Africa the rise of social media certainly contributed to the closure, in 2014, of *heat* SA. The title was the only one in the country that was wholly dedicated to Celebrity news in

[3] Throughout the thesis, the term Celebrity is represented with initial capital letter and without italicisation to indicate that is meant to signal the overarching category that comprises both the *Emerging Celebrity* and the *Celebrity Proper* with the characteristics that define them as discussed in Chapter 3 and 4 respectively.

all its sections. All the weekly magazines that have survived *heat* SA have only limited sections devoted to entertainment or showbusiness news and personalities. Internationally, while exclusive Celebrity-news weeklies have survived despite the advent of social media, even a cursory glance seems to reveal that things are not the same as during the first decade of the new millennium, which some have termed the 'Celebrity decade'.

At the time, I anticipated that, on the local landscape at least, *heat* SA's closure might result in the next shift in weekly magazine representation of fame. There was an expectation that a new, dominant, post-*heat* figure might surface in weekly printed-magazine coverage. In other words, *heat*'s closure offered an opportunity to look at the understanding of fame that was unfolding as we moved towards the middle of the 21st century.

As with the historical part of the project, the research process again involved an examination of *who* was considered representation-worthy, *what* was included in the coverage and *how* this coverage was executed. Applying research and analysis methods to the unfolding understanding of fame provided an opportunity to reflect on the process as well as on the trajectory of fame that had been traced across the 20th century.

Titled *The Figure Now*, Chapter 5 examines this unfolding representation of fame. However, it proved challenging to identify any new and typical personality that is considered coverage-worthy and, also, any distinctly new quality, aspect or characteristic that is mentioned in the coverage. Rather, it seems there is a return, generally, to coverage including the *Star* and the *Emerging Celebrity*, with select elements of the *Celebrity Proper* and of the Hero, but crucially not of the *Epic Hero*, also occasionally appearing.

So, in the end, as the chapter notes, it seems almost impossible to argue for the emergence of a distinctly new figure characterising the post-*heat* period. In the apparent absence of a new typical figure, the chapter argues, it is perhaps more appropriate to speak of an 'understanding' of fame, which appears to encompass a dispersal of qualities that characterise existing figures in the trajectory. In addition, the chapter also notes how this last understanding of fame is characterised by a kind of hybridity, a term that points to individual personalities surfacing as two (or, on very rare occasions, more) different figures from the existing trajectory.

As there appears to be no distinctly new figure, in contrast to the previous chapters, no one local weekly magazine emerges as a strikingly pre-eminent, dominant example of this new understanding of fame. Consequently, the chapter draws on coverage taken from all the

local weekly magazine titles with substantial entertainment content, in an attempt to explore potential shifts in how fame is represented and, as with the other chapters, taking into account how these movements correspond with, or differ from, the international Celebrity-news print-media landscape.

Chapter 1:
The *Epic Hero* in *Huisgenoot* in the early 20th century

The difference between the figure that emerged in early 21st century magazine coverage in South Africa and the one that surfaced almost 100 years before could not be more pronounced. Where the more recent figure was covered in terms of bad behaviour in the private realm and for displaying supposed physical imperfections, its earlier counterpart was in a way its antithesis. This is because magazine coverage of the early 20th century in South Africa seemed to have a singular focus on 'perfection' and the model behaviour displayed almost exclusively during public engagements and appearances.

This emphasis on exemplariness in the coverage brought to the fore a figure who appeared to excel, to set an example, to be a model in terms of behaviour and life choices made. All of these character traits are strongly reminiscent of those displayed by the 'hero', who has broadly been defined, by Susan Drucker (1994: 83), amongst others, as a "central personage taking an admirable part in any remarkable action or event; hence, a person regarded as a model". These actions included "brave and noble deeds" well into the Middle Ages, Drucker and Robert Cathcart (1994: 1–3) note, and also, later, ideas of "extraordinary bravery, firmness, or greatness of soul in connection with any pursuit, work, or enterprise" and the ability to transcend "ordinary human qualities" and embody "the divine, the ideal, the quest, the courageous, the virtuous, the superior".

In some instances, the actions of the famous figure that emerged in magazine coverage of the early 20th century seemed heroic in the epic sense. A sense of the epic emerges strongly when the presence of the divine is hinted at in descriptions of action and there is mention of the embodiment of shared civilizational values, two of the main characteristics William Harmon and Hugh Holman (1999) identify. In addition, it has been argued that evidence of an inner life in the protagonist of the epic is absent or at least not conflicted. William Dixon, (1912: 295) for instance, describes this figure as "a man of deeds not of feelings, whose inner life is without hesitations, who reacts upon circumstances with the directness and simplicity of a child". This last character trait is of great significance, as going forward in the century much would change in this regard.

The notion of the epic can also be linked to a kind of trial or what Joseph Campbell (in Drucker 1994) calls the "archetypal journey" that characterises what Campbell describes as the "monomyth":

> The standard path of the mythological adventure of the hero is a magnification of the formula represented in the rite of passage: separation-initiation-return: which might be named the nuclear unit of the monomyth. A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man. (Campbell, in Drucker 1994: 84–85)

The idea of 'bestowing boons' on fellow members of society or harnessing personal efforts for the greater good implies, to me, the notion of the heroic actions happening, for the most part, in the *public* as opposed to in the private sphere. Bravery, greatness and pioneering spirit; all of these attributes associated with the heroic are generally expressed in the public arena: on battlefields, in wild lands and in uncharted waters. Not only is greatness almost exclusively achieved in the public arena, but in real life these figures can also generally be glimpsed only in public spaces, typically squares and arenas, as Lance Strate (in Drucker & Cathcart 1994) reminds us.

The people selected for magazine coverage in South Africa in the early 20th century and the actions and character traits for which they were selected generally had something of the heroic, and most even the epic. In other words, a sense of the epic surfaced not only from the *who* or the kind of people selected for inclusion in the magazine but also from the *why*, or the kinds of actions or behaviour for which they were covered. Moreover, this notion of the heroic in the epic sense was also greatly amplified by the *how*, or the way in which the coverage was executed, an important element that will be addressed in the rest of this chapter. So this first figure to emerge in the trajectory is named the *Epic Hero*.

Campbell's "region of supernatural wonder" may arguably still be the exclusive domain of the protagonists of the original Greek epics, but many of the personal qualities associated with these men continue to appear, centuries later, in many other genres, extending not just into literary fiction but even into the coverage of real people, in the mass media and magazines.

They may, of course, not display every single characteristic associated with the original epic Homer and his peers brought to life in their poetry, but in broad terms, the people considered to warrant representation can basically be said to be living their lives in accordance with the main characters appearing in these poems. They are, in fact, represented as models, as their lives are worthy of being recounted and celebrated, and

they embody the ideal of the civilisation or community from which they hail. Invoking the necessary sense of elevation, Amy Henderson (2005: 38) calls them the "Great Men on a Pedestal", and her rendition of this title, with every significant word capitalised, certainly seems justified. Examining the "changing face of celebrity culture" in the United States over the 20th century, she notes how:

> Heroes of the Revolutionary era [in the United States] were invoked to give the nation a sense of historical legitimacy […] Heroes of this era were gentlemen, scholars, and patriots—traditional representatives of such basic social institutions as the state, the military, and the church—and their lives served as examples […] In an age optimistic about an indigenous culture-in-the making, the nation's novelists, poets, essayists, critics, historians, and preachers all entered into the discourse with gusto, seeking to construct not only a national narrative, but to create the epic's protagonist. (Henderson 2005: 38–39)

1.1 Early *Huisgenoot*'s *Epic Heroes*

The South African magazine *Huisgenoot*[4] followed a similar path on the local landscape, as its coverage broadly followed a formula that, besides embodying the ideal, celebrated courage, both physical and moral, and the victorious emergence after extended 'battle' with opposing forces, threats and challenges. Its appropriation of the epic formula had early *Huisgenoot* celebrating people who embodied the entire community from which they came; and their individual battles represented those of the entire community, in this case the Afrikaans readership of the magazine. In this way, the epic formula was made contextually specific to the magazine's readership.

Concern for the fate of a nation or people, which is one of the key characteristics of epic poetry, seemed to have particular resonance for early *Huisgenoot*, and this is reflected in the magazine's selection of people. Without fail these individuals are mostly men, again in keeping with the classic heroic tradition, who could be portrayed as role models to be emulated by the emerging Afrikaner nation. The magazine included them in its coverage based specifically on what they had achieved; so, importantly, a sense of merit or worth is implied. These people merited representation; in terms both of what was included in the

[4] The magazine was officially launched as *De Huisgenoot*, reflecting the language medium, namely Dutch, at the time. A few years after the launch, once Afrikaans gained ground and became the official medium in the magazine, the name was changed to *Die Huisgenoot*, with the Afrikaans article 'die' (the) replacing the Dutch 'de'. In 1977, the name changed again, simply to *Huisgenoot* without the article.

coverage and also the way in which the coverage was executed. They could be said to have been representation-worthy.

These model citizens who merited editorial selection were almost always established public figures, and their public-ness is an interesting point to consider, given the magazine's strong focus on domestic life (the name *Huisgenoot* loosely translates to 'home companion') or, put differently, the private sphere. From the outset, the magazine played a very important part in building and educating the Afrikaner nation. Part of its directive was to establish Afrikaans, both the fledgling independent language and the nascent culture, and as such it prescribed how to speak and write 'proper' Afrikaans, what to read, and essentially how to live your life as an Afrikaner in the early 20th century. As Muller (1990) reminds us, the magazine had a very particular quest: to uplift its readership.[5] In addition, it can be described as an informal cultural textbook of sorts to help guide the Afrikaner nation's early struggle for independence from both their Dutch and British colonisers.

When one considers the fledgling Afrikaner nation and *Huisgenoot*'s stake in it, there are definitely echoes with Benedict Anderson's "imagined political community", which he defines as a "deep, horizontal comradeship". It is an imagined community, Anderson (1991: 6–7) explains, as "members […] will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion". These imagined communities, Anderson (1991) argues, became possible largely because of mass media publishing in the shared language of the particular community, with the establishment of this new language, Afrikaans, of course being one of the key functions of early *Huisgenoot*.

[5] Muller (1990: 256–257, translation from Afrikaans my own) writes how:
"*Huisgenoot* […] was 'n huis met ruimte vir veel meer as net die taal. Afrikaners en die Afrikanerlewe moes op alle terreine tot 'n hoër en edeler peil verhef word. Hulle moes aan die invloed van die Westerse kultuur blootgestel word. Hul denke moes genuanseerd raak en deur kennis gestut word. Die beeldende kunste en uitvoerende kunste moes 'n plek in hulle lewe kry. Hul geskiedenis moes aan hulle voorgehou word om hulle te laat verstaan wie en wat hulle is. Hulle moes hul eie identiteit ontdek om nie namaaksels van ander te probeer wees nie. Hulle moes bewus gemaak word van die uitnemende gawes wat hul land in oormaat ontvang het, die vermoë en begeerte aankweek om dit vir 'n hoër lewensgehalte te gebruik en die bedagsaamheid ontwikkel om te bewaar wat nie vernietig durf word nie".
(*Huisgenoot* […] was a house with space for much more than just the language. Afrikaners and Afrikaner life had to be uplifted in all spheres to a higher and nobler level. They had to be exposed to the influence of Western culture. Their thoughts had to become nuanced and supported with knowledge. The fine and dramatic arts had to have a place in their life. Their history had to be held up to them to help them understand who and what they are. They had to discover their own identity so as not to be imitations of others. They had to be made aware of the outstanding gifts that their country received in abundance, cultivate the ability and desire to use it in the interests of a higher quality of life and develop the consideration to preserve that which should not be destroyed.)

In its mission to aid in the creation of the Afrikaner nation by establishing the language and providing general upliftment and guidance to its members, then, *Huisgenoot* held up public figures as examples or models for proper living in an era of newfound independence, and included subtle encouragement to its readership to emulate their behaviour, which was almost exclusively only ever seen in public spaces, in the private realm of the home.

Early *Huisgenoot*'s editorial decision to reserve coverage almost exclusively for men who had already died further serves to amplify the idea of the epic, as it contributed, in a way, to myth- and legend-making. These dead men's actions were things of the (often very distant) past, and the image the public held of them was already fixed; there was no unfolding narrative and no current or future actions that could possibly contradict what already existed. So instead of an unfolding, episodic narrative, which would come to strongly characterise weekly magazine coverage a century later, what we see in early *Huisgenoot* is the notion of the life story and, in fact, the *completed* life story, with a beginning, a middle and an end. The completion inherent in posthumous coverage enables the notion of biography, which in early *Huisgenoot* became propagandist hagiography, defined almost exclusively by reverence, respect, uncritical and unwavering support and flattering embellishment.

Recounting the stories of the dead also suggests the passing of tales from one generation to the next, which in turn contributes to a sense of the heroic. As Nick Trujillo and Leah Vande Berg (1994: 221) remind us, in relation to traditional understandings of the heroic, "Narratives about the hero were passed from generation to generation, and the hero, in death more than in life, became an exalted figure in the culture's history".

From the 1916 launch issue of *Huisgenoot* onwards, we see coverage of the pioneering Voortrekkers who had left the Cape Colony to escape British imperialism almost a century before the magazine was founded, and the Boer soldiers who fought the British in the two fin-de-siècle Anglo-Boer (now known as South African) wars. Politicians and *taalstryders* (literally translatable as language warriors) were also taking up the pen to set the rules and a body of literature for a language in the process of distinguishing itself from its Dutch origin. The men covered in early *Huisgenoot* were warriors in the battle to establish the fledgling Afrikaner nation, its identity, its language, its religion, and its very moral fibre.

Thus, in issue after issue, we see men being heralded for their ability to use their respected positions in society as politicians, pioneers, soldiers, authors and artists to fight for the greater cause of Afrikaner nationalism. From the launch edition onwards, these people

appeared on the cover of *Huisgenoot*, and, unlike on the covers of weekly magazines a century later, they appeared one by one. During the first few decades of the magazine's existence, these framed and posed, professional-studio-photographed, black-and-white portraits dominated the otherwise pared down and uncluttered covers, with hardly any other visual or text elements beside the title/masthead. Reminiscent of the painted portraits initially exclusively made of "emperors, kings and generals", as Richard Howells (2011: 112) argues, these photographic portraits, as well as the way they were employed in the overall cover design, served to revere and exalt, and in the process support the heroic representation.

The list of portraits appearing on the covers of the magazine in its launch year can be read as an indication of an editorial formula driven by the heroic. Of the twelve monthly issues, three covers featured politicians (South African Republic president Paul Kruger in May 1916 and Orange Free State presidents J.H. Brand and F.W. Reitz in July and November 1916 respectively), three featured Voortrekkers (Piet Retief in June 1916, Karel Trichardt in October 1916 and Andries Pretorius in March 1917), two featured church ministers (Ds. (Rev.) D.J. Kestell in December 1916 and Dr Andrew Murray[6] in February 1917), three featured poets and authors (Jan Celliers in September 1916, Jan Hofmeyr in January 1917 and Melt Brink in April 1917) and there was one Anglo-Boer War general, Piet Joubert, on the August 1916 cover. Politicians, preachers and pioneers on the cover, as well as Afrikaans poets who contributed to the establishment of the language: this trend continued, with the odd Boer general, Afrikaner lawyer and artist also appearing, for a good many years. With the characteristically epic concept of a protracted journey to freedom filled with many dramatised hardships, the Great Trek provided the perfect setting for the emergence of the *Epic Hero* figure, as did the military scenarios of the two Anglo-Boer wars. From the 1830s onwards, the Dutch-speaking inhabitants of the then Cape Colony started moving eastwards by ox wagon and on foot into the interior of what has now become known as South Africa, in order to escape British rule. These pioneers were known as Voortrekkers (the literal meaning is 'front pullers', or 'those who pull in front') or Boers.

From its inception, *Huisgenoot* took advantage of these historic events to sketch a kind of romanticised shared past populated with a list of figures all contributing handsomely to the establishment of the Afrikaner nation in their own individual ways. Crucially, the magazine's

[6] Despite his English-sounding name, Dr Murray was born in Graaff-Reinet in South Africa in 1828 and was a prominent minister in the Dutch Reformed Church, whose members in South Africa were almost exclusively Afrikaans-speaking.

focus, in its hagiographic coverage of these men, was almost exclusively on their actions in the public sphere, with very little space afforded to details of their private lives.

When there is detail of the private, it is almost always used in some way in support of the public image. The magazine's July 1916 profile of commandant-general of the South African Republic Piet Joubert, for instance, employed a kind of grand, elevated style (using phrases such as "*grote daden*" (great deeds), "*reusachtige opofferingen*" (giant sacrifices) and "*hartstocht voor die vrijheid*" (passion for freedom) that have epic overtones to emphasise the connection between the Great Trek and two wars and dwells on how together they provided the perfect environment for the emergence of General Joubert the *Epic Hero*. It also portrayed General Joubert as being the very embodiment of the early 19th-century Afrikaner's strife for freedom from British rule. Often associated with the journey underlying the epic, the idea of "leaving as boys and returning as men" also emerges firmly in this profile of General Joubert:

> *Dat was een tijd van grote daden van reusachtige opofferingen en van rustige liefde. Toen is een volk geboren uit de hartstocht voor de vrijheid en het lijden en de dood van velen. Die bladzijde uit de geschiedenis van het volk van Zuid-Afrika is gewijd, daar ze geschreven is met het bloed van helden en heldinnen. Petrus Jacobus Joubert was een kind van deze tijd, een kind van de vrijheid. Wie hem wil verstaan moet nimmer dit uit't oog verliezen. Door zijn ganse leven heen gaat de invloed van de Grote Trek, die zoveel kinderen riepen tot mannentaak.*
>
> That was a time of great deeds and giant sacrifices and of quiet love. It is when a nation was born from the passion for freedom and the suffering and death of many. The pages from the history of the nation of South Africa are holy, as they were written in the blood of heroes and heroines. Petrus Jacobus Joubert was a child of this time, a child of freedom. Whoever wants to understand him should never lose sight of this. Throughout his whole life he was influenced by the Great Trek, which called so many children to men's work.[7]

While the link between elements traditionally associated with the epic and representations of Voortrekkers, soldiers and statesmen is fairly straightforward and easily imagined, the extension of this kind of coverage to include poets, authors, artists and clergymen seem to contribute to what Leo Braudy (1986), in his history of fame, calls an the "top layer" of what

[7] "*Levenschets Genl. Petrus Jacobus Joubert*", *De Huisgenoot*, July 1916. All translations of excerpts from *Huisgenoot* articles are my own.

was conceived of as a natural hierarchy in early understandings of fame, whether it be the Roman "fame through public actions" (Braudy 1986: 56), the Christian "fame of the spirit" (1986: 150) or the literary "fame of the wise" (1986: 167).

Yet it is essentially in terms of the same formula that Afrikaans clergymen, poets, authors and artists, all of them 'intellectual' men who would not naturally be associated with the generally more physical figure of the *Epic Hero*, seem to be portrayed in early *Huisgenoot*. In a piece on artist Pieter Wenning,[8] for instance, the reader is reminded that Wenning is of Friesian descent and that Friesland, a province of the Netherlands, is inhabited by "*een sterk, kernachtig en onbuigzaam ras […] hetwelk reeds vele grote mannen aan Holland heeft geschonken*" (a strong, pithy and obstinate race […] which has already given many great men to Holland). Another artist, Daniel Cornelis Boonzaaier, is lauded for the way in which his work transcends the artistic and is created in the interests of the nation: "*Om zijn werk ten volle te waarderen, moet men zeker niet uit 't oog verliezen, dat het niet alleen bedoeld is als kunst, maar menigmaal ook om't publiek de een of andere politieke of maatschappelike gedachte klaarder voor ogen te brengen*" (To fully appreciate his work, one should not lose focus on the fact that it is not only meant as art but often also to illuminate some kind of political or social idea).[9] Noteworthy individual contribution to the public good can also be read in the profile of poet Jan F.E. Celliers,[10] who is described as a "'*n digter wat die harklop van sijn volk beluister het en wat weet om dit te vertolk […] Ja, Jan Celliers is 'n groot mens*" (a poet who has listened to the heartbeat of his people and who knows how to interpret it […] Yes, Jan Celliers is a great man). It is noted that his ability to interpret the "heartbeat of his people" was specifically honed during his time as a soldier, another typical characteristic of the epic, in the Second Anglo-Boer War. In his poems, the anonymous "*levenschets*" (literally translatable as 'life sketch'; *Huisgenoot* uses this term for its life-story profile pieces) argues, he is the "*vaderlander*" (lover and defender of his home country) who empathised with and fought alongside his people. He experienced their grief, such as the death-wish of the women and children who were sent to the British concentration camps, and in his poetry can be heard the longing for freedom, the "*weeklag*" (grieving) for the deceased and the belief in the "*loutering*" (purification) and reconciliation that would see flowers grow on the graves of those who gave their lives for the country.

[8] "*Zuid-Afrikaanse Kunst. Pieter Wenning*", *De Huisgenoot*, September 1916.
[9] "*Zuid-Afrikaanse Kunst. Daniel Cornelis Boonzaaier*", *De Huisgenoot*, July 1916.
[10] "*Levenschets. J.F.E. Celliers.*", *De Huisgenoot*, September 1916.

So pervasive is this *leitmotif* that certain elements traditionally associated with the construction of the *Epic Hero* even appear to permeate coverage of 'regular' folks when they eventually started appearing in the magazine, roughly four years after *Huisgenoot*'s launch, in that they were celebrated for their admittedly indirect stake in the establishment of the Afrikaner nation, the quest early *Huisgenoot* so carefully portrayed in epic terms. The first of these to be featured on the cover of the magazine (the issue of January 1920) are octogenarians Sarel Hendrik van Vuuren and his wife, Johanna Magrieta, and the related article alludes to elements such as tenacity, a model way of life and the ability to transcend adversity:

> *Ons oumense […] het vir ons die grondslag gelê van die Afrikaanse kultuur, en as ons 'n suiwer kultuur wil opbouw, pas dit ons om te bewaar wat hulle aan ons toevertrouw het. Hoe kan ons ons roeping hierin beter nakom as om met hulle te praat, en aan ander bekend te maak wat hulle aan ons vertel? Hulle lewenswijse is navolgingswaardig. Met al die wetenskap van die verligte eeuw bring betreklik min mense dit sover om so oud te word as ons oumense, die Voortrekkergeslagte, nieteenstaande al die ontberings in die donkerste tije van ons geskiedenis.*
>
> Our old people […] lay the foundation of the Afrikaans culture, and if we want to erect a pure culture, it makes sense for us to preserve what they have entrusted to us. How can we better honour this calling than to speak to them and tell others what they tell us? Their way of life is exemplary. With all the science of the enlightened age, relatively few people are able to reach such an advanced age as our old people, the Voortrekker generations, despite all their hardships during the darkest days of our history.[11]

Mrs van Vuuren is one of the very few women to appear in the early editions of *Huisgenoot*. I would like to pause for a moment to reflect on the scant coverage of women during these early years. In traditional Western conceptions of the heroic, women are most often "either excluded or assigned lesser roles", Joan Fayer (1994: 27) writes, as they are generally absent from prominent positions on the battlefield, in the pulpit and in religious mythology.

The dearth of women and dominance of men in early *Huisgenoot*'s coverage of famous figures, however, can also be understood in terms of the traditional association of women with the domestic, and by extension private, space, and the almost exclusive preference for

[11] "*Ons Oumense Sarel Hendrik van Vuuren en Johanna Magrieta van Vuuren*", *De Huisgenoot*, January 1920.

action in the public sphere in order to support a narrative of the heroic. Thus women are covered sparingly in early *Huisgenoot*, perhaps so as not to attract too much attention to the domestic and thus private sphere, and on the rare occasions that they are included, care is taken to focus on their contribution to the public good, which often means how their support of their partners (mostly husbands) allowed the latter to thrive and contribute to the establishment of the Afrikaner nation and Afrikaans language. Dunbar Moodie (1975: 17) writes of how the woman at the time "provided a deep well of moral fortitude which complemented and even surpassed her husband's more practical exploits". In terms of heroic rhetoric, the coverage of women in early *Huisgenoot* might not have represented them as heroines in their own right very often, but it did arguably serve to support and ultimately strengthen the emergence of the figure of the male *Epic Hero* from the pages of the magazine. That is certainly the case for the first woman, one Elizabeth Neethling, to appear on a *Huisgenoot* cover (December 1917), representing a rare break in the tradition of only putting men on the cover during the early years. Although in her cover portrait, she is alone and unaccompanied by her husband (perhaps surprisingly *de rigueur* for the few women featured on the cover at the time), she is identified by an honorific title confirming her marital status (Mrs) and seems to have merited inclusion based primarily on her support of her church-minister husband. To a lesser extent she is selected to appear on the cover for her contribution to the collective Afrikaner memory of the male-dominated Anglo-Boer wars, about which she had written a book.

Also, consider the coverage of the De Wet couple,[12] accompanied by a black and white photograph of General and "*Mevrouw C [Christiaan] de Wet*" (Mrs C. [Christiaan] de Wet). With the honorific title and omission of her first name from the article and mention of her undying support of the general, Mrs de Wet is almost exclusively identified in terms of her husband with very little detail given about herself. Her image as stoic supporter of the general (who, despite his greying hair still has the "*vastberaden trek op zijn gezicht die die man van moed en karakter kenmerkt*" (determined expression on his face that characterises this man of courage and character) is further augmented by the reference to her obscurity in the article. It claims to be one of the first portraits of the general's wife to be published, as she is not widely known since her labour occurs more in "*de stilte*" (silence), referring to the domestic and essentially private space of the home, which is not a focus for the magazine at this point.

[12] "*Generaal en Mevrouw C. de Wet*", *De Huisgenoot*, June 1916.

Overall, the individual people that we find in early *Huisgenoot* seem to be portrayed in what we might now see as a fairly 'one-dimensional' or 'not rounded' way, with coverage seeking to highlight only the good, the ideal, the model or the perfect. A profile of church minister Dr Andrew Murray[13] suggests that such a "*reusekarakter*" (giant character) might display "*ander hoedanighede, die nie altijd wenselik is nie*" (other qualities, that are not always desirable), but it does so only to alert us to his own avoidance of such risks, as an introduction to his virtues and near-perfection:

> *So 'n opgebruiking van senuw-energie (soos plaasgevind het, als hij 'n preek lewer) kon lig 'n reaksie teweegbring in die huis—'n bietjie oorgevoeligheid teenoor sijn vrouw, 'n bietjie onegaligheid teenoor sijn kinders, 'n bietjie nukkerigheid teenoor die vreemdeling in sijn poorte. Maar nee: ik het hem nooit van sijn ewewig af gesien nie […] Hij was deur en deur suiwere goud.*
>
> Such an exhaustion of nervouse energy (that might take place when he delivers a sermon) could easily have led to a reaction in the home—a bit of oversensitivity towards his wife, a bit of unevenness towards his children, a bit of huffiness towards the stranger in his gates. But no: I never saw him lose his composure […] He was pure gold through and through.

The fact that this rather glowing endorsement is attributed to one Dr Kolbe, who is described in the article as one of his professional "adversaries", only contributes further to the construction of Dr Murray as a man of great and unwavering character who would not allow external circumstances to disturb his equilibrium. I also read Dr Kolbe's testimonial as a suggestion of the superior and the ideal, character traits Drucker and Cathcart (1994) include in their broad definition of the heroic. Here we have a colleague who is apparently widely known as a professional rival testifying that Dr Murray always manages to avoid the kind of behaviour we would normally expect from others in his position; he is superior to his peers, Dr Kolbe seems to be saying, embodying the ideal we should all aim for, that elusive equilibrium. Dr Kolbe also makes reference to the fact that Dr Murray is "pure gold through and through", with gold of course symbolising a number of characteristics that are commonly associated with the heroic: great human achievement (often rewarded with a gold medal or trophy) and also the divine and the perfect (embodied in concepts such as the 'golden rule').

[13] "*Lewenskets. Dr. Andrew Murray*", *De Huisgenoot*, February 1917.

An interesting, albeit brief, allusion in this extract is to the private space of the home and Dr Murray's family (his wife and children), which is rather unusual for early *Huisgenoot* coverage and certainly also for traditional representations of the *Epic Hero*. Dr Kolbe's reference to the Murray domestic space has a slightly gossipy quality about it, as it is 'small' talk about another person corresponding with definitions in the literature including those by Ralph Rosnow and Gary Fine (1976), Robert Goodman (1994) and Margaret Holland (1996). The detail is superficial, perhaps assumes much and might even be described as speculative, as it is of course quite doubtful Dr Kolbe would have witnessed all of the interactions in Dr Murray's domestic space. But in contrast to how gossip and speculation would come to be applied in magazine coverage of famous people later in the century, it is used here to illustrate and emphasise exemplary qualities. Also, it is important to note how a composed public demeanour is assumed to continue into the private space. 'Best behaviour', usually reserved for public appearances, is maintained even in the private space, where there could be an expectation of letting one's guard down. Underlying this anecdote from Dr Kolbe I infer subtle guidance for the *Huisgenoot* reader in terms of expected behaviour in the private space, based on Dr Murray's always-impeccable public *and* private behaviour.

The perfect human being, or the model man, that emerges in coverage of 'real' living people even seems to permeate the construction of the fictional protagonists in the short stories *Huisgenoot* regularly published in its early drive to actively "create culture through the written word", as Jan Adriaan Pretorius (1973: 18) argues. The lack of what we would now call depth and dimension evident in the magazine's representation of real people appears to be even more pronounced in the protagonists of its short stories and serials. An idealised view of humankind is what the fictional characters of the typical early 20th-century *Huisgenoot* short story display, as Pretorius (1973) points out:

> Hierdie beskouing van die mens bring mee dat die dualisme goed en kwaad nie binne een mens gepolariseer word nie, maar die verdeling is só dat slegs één van die pole binne die geestesomvang van een mens kan lê. Daarom die 'volmaakte helde en heldinne' aan die een kant en die 'volslae skurke' aan die ander kant. (Pretorius, 1973: 195)[14]
>
> This view implies that the good–evil duality cannot be polarised in one person, but the division is so that only one of the poles can lie within the emotional capacity of one

[14] All translations of secondary references from Afrikaans are my own.

person. Thus the 'perfect heroes and heroines' on the one hand and the 'complete criminals' on the other hand.

Besides covering a host of figures that at least loosely fit the classic heroic formula and emphasising a set of qualities associated with this kind of figure in its coverage of others, including renowned figures such as Afrikaans poets, artists and preachers and relatively unknown people like wives of the famous and even Sarel and Johanna van Vuuren, the magazine also had other links with the epic tradition that emerge in its coverage of prominent figures.

One of these links was with the oral tradition. At the time of the magazine's launch in the early 20th century, Afrikaans was slowly edging towards a more oral than written tradition, and it is the former rather than the latter that has most often been associated with the idea of the epic, as has been argued perhaps most famously by Milman Parry and Albert Lord in the 1920s. It is in the stories the magazine chose to tell about the people it documented, and, importantly, the way in which these stories were told, that the *Epic Hero* of oral culture seems to emerge most strongly. Early *Huisgenoot*'s tales, especially those documenting the Anglo-Boer wars and the Great Trek, are certainly reminiscent of campfire stories, sometimes given mythical and extraordinary elements by embellishment, with which the elders used to regale the youth. See for instance the dramatised exoticism that emerges in this profile piece on Voortrekker Karel Trichardt.[15] "*Ons het 'n land gaan soek, waar ons van die Engelsmans bevrijd sal wees*", he says, in an explanation of the Trichardt family's decision to leave the Cape Colony that belies his steadfast adherence to principles. "*Onder hom blij ons geen dag langer, al moet ons ook in die woestijn die dood sterwe deur woeste barbare of ongedierte*" (We went in search of a country where we will be free of the Englishman. Not another day will we serve under him, even if we have to die in the desert by the hand of fierce barbarians or beasts). The article reveals that in the end it was not barbarian or beast but the mosquito and the tsetse fly that led to the death of a large contingent of the Trichardt clan in the first half of the 19th century.

An anecdote by a British gravedigger quoted in another article, on Kommandant Gideon Scheepers,[16] sketches a vivid and eerie image of his exhumation. Commander Scheepers was executed by a British firing squad during the Second Anglo-Boer War, buried and then

[15] Stockenström, Eric, "*Levenskets. Karel Johannes Trichardt*", *De Huisgenoot*, October 1916.
[16] JAS, *"Waar is Scheepers se graf?"*, *Die Huisgenoot*, 27 April 1928.

shortly after exhumed and reburied, apparently in order to prevent his family from knowing the location of his remains:

> *Dit was 'n verskriklike donker nag toe ons die lyk weer gaan opgrawe het. Onderwyl ons besig was om die lyk op te grawe, het 'n vreeslike storm opgekom. Bliksemstrale het herhaalde male die aaklige toneel verlig. Ons was nouliks klaar met hierdie deel van ons taak, toe die storm op ons losbars. Struikel-struikel oor die ongelyke veld het ons vyf met die lyk voortgesukkel. Waarheen weet ek nie, maar eindelik het ons onder 'n klompie doringbome sagte grond gevind, en so gou as ons kon Scheepers weer begrawe, en die grond gelyk getrap. Niemand moes die plek vind nie. Dit was die bevele.*
>
> It was a terribly dark night when we went to exhume the body. While we were busy digging, a terrible storm was gathering. Lightning bolts lit up the awful scene time and again. We were barely done with this part of our task when the storm hit us. We stumbled across the uneven field, the five of us with the body. Where I did not know, but we finally found a soft patch of soil under a gathering of thorn trees and reburied Scheepers as quickly as we could and levelled the soil. No one must find the place. Those were the orders.

The fact that the locations of Commander Scheepers' execution and reburial were deliberately withheld, with the article mentioning that his parents were apparently still searching for his remains at the time of their death towards the middle of the 20th century, of course further cemented his status as a martyr and ultimately as a *Epic Hero* in the Afrikaans community.

That the general figure of the *Epic Hero* seemed to resonate so profoundly with Afrikaners in the first few decades of the 20th century is hardly surprising. The socio-cultural landscape at the time was an ideal backdrop for the emergence of a set of characters, hailing from Afrikaner ranks, who displayed epic traits. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Afrikaners were busy establishing their identity as a nation. It was more than a decade since the end of the Second Anglo-Boer War, and many Afrikaans-speakers had or were in the process of moving from rural to urban areas and were slowly starting to become accustomed to life under the British rule of the Union of South Africa. The transition was an uncomfortable one that was partly responsible for the rise of strong feelings of patriotism amongst the Afrikaner community at the time, as Van der Westhuizen (1973: 187) argues: "Daar het in hierdie jare 'n sterk behoefte by die Afrikaner ontstaan om saam te staan en

homself uit sy minderwaardige sosiaal-ekonomiese posisie op te hef" (During these years, a strong need emerged amongst the Afrikaner to stand united and lift the nation up out of its inferior socio-economic position). It follows that strong figures that could restore hope and faith and provide guidance were in great demand at the time.

Not so much in demand in early *Huisgenoot* were figures that might have contradicted the magazine's editorial mission at the time, and it is as important and interesting to consider these absences as who was selected for and included in coverage. The idea of being celebrated or known for less exemplary, even transgressive or scandalous, characteristics or behaviour, or simply for criminal activities, goes back to earlier days in the broad history of fame in Western civilization. An example here is the 18th century Italian author and adventurer Giacomo Casanova, who became so famous for his multiple, elaborate and complicated relationships with women that the name 'Casanova' has now come to mean 'womaniser'. The well-known American train robbers of the 19th century, including Jesse James and Butch Cassidy, are further examples. It is important to note that in the case of these men, there could be said to be a blurring of the heroic and the transgressive and with that categories of fame, because Casanova's sexual prowess could be said to have offered at least the possibility of being worthy of admiration and emulation, and, as Paul Kooistra (1990) reminds us in his article 'Criminals as Heroes', robbers such as James certainly had a sense of the heroic about them. Yet it is important to draw a distinction here, as in all these cases, the possible heroism precludes a sense of the epic as it involves an element of transgression.

In addition to criminals and controversial figures that may be portrayed as having something heroic about them, there are, of course, also those known for nothing other than committing crimes. Elizabeth Barry (2008), for instance, argues that public court proceedings and executions are ways in which people became known in the past, and the implication here is that this form of well-knownness grew from nothing but criminal behaviour. Barry writes, in her introduction to a special edition of the *International Journal of Cultural Studies* devoted to 'A Cultural History of Celebrity', that:

> The engines of fame – royal recognition, state honours, religious canonization, the laurels of artistic achievement – in fact operate side by side with […] the popular press, the circulation of printed images, theatre and music halls, *public trials and hangings* – in the early modern and Enlightenment world, as well as in our own. (Barry 2008: 252, emphasis added)

In early 20th century South Africa, there must have been an awareness of personal stories that were based not on ideal or perfect behaviour but on various forms of 'negative' or at least 'controversial' attributes and qualities.

In terms of the Afrikaner community, the 19th-century Cape colony frontiersman Coenraad de Buys[17] at first glance seems, for instance, an excellent candidate for coverage in early *Huisgenoot* as, in a way, he seems to fit the magazine's model of fame. He was a pioneer, widely described as 'remarkable' and 'impressive' because of his large stature (he was apparently seven foot tall) and also his self-confidence. In *The Afrikaners* (2003), his biography of the Afrikaner people, Hermann Giliomee writes how travellers described him with 'awe'. With his Dutch heritage, De Buys is said to have been the founding father of one of the first Afrikaans communities and was known to have clashed with the British during the frontier wars of the late 18th century. However, he was absent from early *Huisgenoot*, an absence that can most likely be attributed to the other elements for which he was widely known: for being an interracial polygamist, and for mostly siding with the Xhosa people, against both the British and the Boers, in battle.

I refer to De Buys here in an attempt to illustrate how in the early 20th century, when *Huisgenoot* launched, there were undoubtedly people in South Africa, also in the Afrikaans community, who were already known not necessarily for their exemplariness but rather, or also, for their waywardness, their rebelliousness, their inability to meet societal expectation. But these people seem to be largely absent from the local magazine coverage, and the focus of the coverage of individual people generally can be said to be on contrasting qualities to rebelliousness and ostensible transgression.

Exemplary and inspiring figures were what the readers needed and wanted, the *Huisgenoot* launch team seemed to think, with launch editor Professor J.J. Smith explaining in a retrospective memoir-style article published in the magazine in the 1940s how, "*Deur lewensbeskrywinge van groot Afrikaners […] het ons probeer om met die smaak van ons lesers enigsins rekening te hou*" (Through profile pieces on prominent Afrikaners […] we tried to keep pace with the taste of our readers as far as possible).[18]

The figure of the *Epic Hero* was also still consistently paraded "om [lesers] weer met moed en idealisme te help besiel" (to help inspire readers again with courage and idealism) by Prof

[17] For more on De Buys, see Rian Malan's *My Traitor's Heart* (1991) and Willem Anker's *Buys: 'n Grensroman* (2016).
[18] *Die Huisgenoot*, 28 November 1941.

Smith's successor from 1931, Markus Viljoen. In an interview with Jurie Joubert (1983: 9), Viljoen further explains how he:

> moes die volk voortdurend herinner aan die mees heroïeke tydperke in sy geskiedenis – die Trek en van die twee Vryheidsoorloë. Geleidelik het ek dus begin met geskiedkundige bydraes, eers algemene artikels om bepaalde gebeurtenisse te herdenk, daarna reekse herinneringe van oudstryders, artikels oor al die beroemde veldslae, oor die leiers en die bannelingkampe. Hierdie artikels het onmiddelik weerklank gevind by die lesers […]
>
> had to continuously remind the nation of the most heroic time periods in its history – the Trek and the two Boer wars. So gradually I began with historical contributions, first general articles to commemorate specific events, thereafter series of memories of retired soldiers, articles about all the famous battles, about the leaders and the prisoner of war camps. These articles immediately resonated with the readers […]

As a significant part of the process involved the establishment of the Afrikaans language as separate from Dutch and equal in status to English, the natural progression was for the epic formula to be extended to encompass the *taalstryders*: Afrikaans poets and authors. Giliomee (2003: 359) notes that: "At the heart of the Afrikaner nationalist struggle was the attempt to imagine a new national community with its language enjoying parity of esteem with English in the public sphere. Only then would the sense of being marginalized be overcome." Seemingly born out of a sense of marginalisation, these feelings of nationalism gave way to the Second Language Movement, Van Eeden (1981) argues, in which printed media such as *Huisgenoot* played a key role. At the time of the magazine's launch, the Afrikaans nation was the largest in the Union, but Afrikaans-speakers were both linguistically and politically divided and seen as lagging behind on a cultural level, so it was feared, as Pretorius (1973) points out, that they were feeling increasingly inferior in relation to other cultural groups in the country, particularly the English-speaking population.

The Second Language Movement was part of the rise of Afrikaner nationalism, which Moodie (in Louw, 2004) describes as a kind of civil religion incorporating the history of the Afrikaans people, their language and Afrikaner Calvinism, from the end of the 19th century onwards. Specifically in its early years, *Huisgenoot* served as a mouthpiece, the ideal medium for the transmission of this ideology, and it seemed to do so by declaring its focus on everything that it deemed pure, good and true in the Afrikaner nation. In so doing, the

magazine in a way set the scene for and by extension automatically 'nominated' figures that displayed the kind of qualities associated with the *Epic Hero*. Notice, for instance, the singular focus on strength and untaintedness, both key characteristics in the epic, in the closing line of the "*Opmerking van de Redaktie*" (Remarks from the Editorial Team) in the 1916 launch issue: "[*O*]*ns Afrikaans volk [is] een sterk volk, dat de schoonste eigenschappen in zich heeft*" (Our Afrikaner nation is a strong nation, with the purest of character traits).

A preference for the portrayal of subjects as an embodiment of the 'ideal' can also be read as an indication of the general idealism guiding *Huisgenoot*'s editorial decisions in the early years of its existence. Johannes Froneman (2004: 67–68, emphasis added) writes of how the magazine placed, "swaar klem […] in terme van […] 'n *idealistiese* drang om as selfstandige volk met 'n eie taal en kultuur erken te word" (strong emphasis […] in terms of […] an *idealistic* urge to be acknowledged as an independent nation with an own language and culture). Hence the magazine's editorial selection of subjects who could be said to further this quest and its idealisation of their individual contributions to the point where they are represented as 'model' citizens, or model Afrikaners.

Given this original editorial mission, *Huisgenoot* seemed to follow the international publishing trend that dominated the period around World War I (1914–1918). Theodore Peterson (1956) writes of how magazines around this time could generally be classified as belonging to one of two broad categories, which he names "missionary" and "merchant". Whereas the latter is mainly guided by financial or commercial imperatives, the former is driven by idealism. Early *Huisgenoot* belongs to the missionary category, which, according to Peterson (1956: 209–210) "did not necessarily propagate a religious gospel […] but a faith in a way of life". Its unwavering focus on everything and everyone that is ideal and exemplary in Afrikaner ranks is testimony to that.

The textual evidence drawn from *Huisgenoot* reveals how a significant part of the nation-building directive the magazine sets itself is fulfilled by portraying a handful of Afrikaners as "role models for the young, inspiration for the citizenry", another description of the heroic offered by Drucker and Cathcart (1994: 2).

Yet in its early years, the magazine seemed largely to avoid coverage of contemporary role models and inspirational figures, opting rather to reach back in time. Pretorius (1973: 18) describes this editorial notion in *Huisgenoot* as "shifting back in history", giving preference to coverage of the late over that of the living. In a sense, this "shifting back" made early *Huisgenoot* a consumer of the existing epic rhetoric surrounding its selection of famous

figures; most of the men covered had already consolidated their *Epic Hero* image in the collective imaginary of the Afrikaner nation by the early 20th century, and *Huisgenoot* merely re-presented these already established figures.

The heroic tends to be constantly elusive, Gary Whannel (2002) argues, but less philosophical reasons might have influenced *Huisgenoot*'s search for its *Epic Hero* figures in the history books and not the newspapers. This editorial choice might have been partially influenced by the magazine's production process; still a monthly mass-media publication at the time, it could not disseminate news in the way a newspaper would, namely shortly after a news event transpired. Consequently, its focus was on secondary eventualities or news events. Its writers had the leisure of doing in-depth research and producing articles contextualising important historical events, Van Eeden (1981) explains. And, although the weekly printing and distribution frequency had a powerful influence on the nature of magazine representations of fame going into the 21st century, as I argue in Chapter 4, *Huisgenoot*'s change of frequency from monthly to weekly in 1923 did not seem to make a visible difference to who it covered, what it covered them for, or how it approached this coverage. There was no sign yet, with this change of publishing frequency, of any movement towards the 21st-century trend of covering unfolding narratives of living public figures, rather than posthumous life stories with a beginning, a middle and an end. Rather, the editor's letter in the first weekly edition[19] announces that the higher frequency "*getuig van groeikrag, ondernemingsgees en 'n onwrikbare vertroue in die toekoms van ons volk en taal*" (attests to vigour, entrepreneurial spirit and a steadfast faith in the future of our nation and language). Looking to the future through great deeds and people of the past is not an unfamiliar concept in the nationalist agenda. Tom Nairn (1977: 343) writes that nationalism is characterised by both progress and regress. "[I]t is through nationalism that societies try to propel themselves forward to certain kinds of goals […] by a certain kind of regression – by looking inwards, drawing men deeply upon their indigenous resources, resurrecting past folk heroes and myths about themselves and so on".

Although 18th and 19th-century Afrikaner history was certainly romanticised by *Huisgenoot* during the first half of the 20th century, it could be argued that the underlying elements of this history created a fertile breeding ground for a nascent mythology of the Afrikaans *Epic Hero*. The underlying elements include the frontier mentality (or *weltanschauung*) fostered, as Dan O'Meara (1979) notes, through many years of isolation from the urban sphere,

[19] The first weekly edition of *Die Huisgenoot* was dated 23 November 1923.

numerous battles fought against local African tribes and a rigid patriarchal Calvinist tradition. Towards the end of the 19th century, the small Afrikaner/Boer victories over the British achieved during the Anglo-Boer War further consolidated the growth and development of this collection of Afrikaner *Epic Hero* figures. Quoting Moodie, veteran South African journalist and political commentator Allister Sparks (1990) wrote:

> [During the Anglo-Boer War] An army of backward farmers had measured themselves against the regiments of the world's mightiest power and emerged with the knowledge that they were as good and better. Out of the war came new heroes to worship [...] it was a national epic of suffering and death, and it has been woven together with the Great Trek into the sacred history of the Afrikaner *volk*, the basis of their apocalyptic vision of themselves as a chosen people with a special mission to fulfil. (Sparks 1990:126, original emphasis retained)

Given the Afrikaner nation's patriarchal origins, it is not surprising that *Huisgenoot*'s *Epic Hero*, not unlike classic protagonists of Greek and Roman epics, was almost exclusively male at the beginning of the 20th century. Sparks (1990) wrote of how both the Great Trek and the Anglo-Boer War served to reinforce the patriarchal system, and the effect it had on the perception of the past:

> For all their individualism, the Boers had always tended to be a patriarchal society: they had given fierce loyalty to their leaders during the Great Trek; within each family the father was a law unto himself and a total autocrat over his domain. Now, with the [Anglo-Boer] war, this personality cult was reinforced. Just as the heroic past became sanctified, so did the heroes become deified. (Sparks 1990:127)

Huisgenoot's approach to Second-Anglo-Boer-War and Great-Trek history, particularly that published under the editorship of Markus Viljoen, is succinctly summarised by Floris van Jaarsveld and reminiscent of Whannel's (2002) observation that there is great nostalgia for an elusive past: "Daar was 'n romantiese verlange terug na die verlede, 'n verheerliking en idealisering van die Republikeinse geskiedenis" (There was a romantic longing for the past, an exultation and idealisation of the Republican history) (Van Jaarsveld, in Joubert 1983: 134).

1.2 Paul Kruger: Afrikaner *Epic Hero*

At least in terms of column inches of coverage devoted to hagiographic accounts honouring his legacy, perhaps the most celebrated of the early *Huisgenoot Epic Hero* was president of

the South African Republic (ZAR) Paul Kruger, who died in 1904, more than a decade before the magazine's launch.

A stark, single black-and-white portrait image of the ZAR president in the middle of the page and surrounded by plenty of white space and two thin frames created an arresting and decidedly reverent cover for the 1916 launch issue of the magazine. This launch cover seems to set the intention for the kind of figure who merited coverage and *Huisgenoot*'s initial editorial direction.

The accompanying article inside the magazine is a 2 000-word profile in the prominent page-three position. "*De helden van't verleden, behoren aan't nageslacht*" (The heroes of the past belong to future generations), reads the opening line of this hagiographic profile piece,[20] making it clear that the magazine intends to act as a consumer and re-presenter of a figure that it imagines already occupying the image of *Epic Hero* in the collective imagination of its readership. Anticipating a keen focus on the 'everyday minutiae' that would come to characterise magazine representations of fame roughly a century on, the article continues to justify this re-presentation in the rest of the opening paragraphs:

> *Beter dan eigen tijdgenoten dat vermogen, kunnen de nakomelingen doorzien en begrijpen, wat leefde in de ziel van een grote, die voor hen kwam. 't Klein gebeuren van iedere dag valt weg en 't blijvende, 't eeuwigsterke treedt op de voorgrond. Doch vooral hieraan kent 't nageslacht hem, die groot was onder zijn volk, dat hij vooruitgezien heeft de behoeften van de komende tijd. Laten zijn slapen de kroon gedragen hebben. Zijn hand aan't zwaard gevoerd, zijn schouders omworpen zijn geweest met de profetemantel. Zijn taak was niet afgelopen toen zijn oog brak, de moede hand 't zwaard ontglipte en voor eeuwig de mond zweeg, die woorden van wijsheid sprak. His is daar, omdat zijn scherpsiend oog uitzag naar de toekomst en hij vroom beluisterde de stemmen, die uit een wordende tijd tot hem kwamen.*
> *Zo hebben we 't beeld te zien, van die krijgsman-staatsman, Paul Kruger, de ziener, die blijkte in de toekomst en door wat zijn helderziend oog zag zijn daden liet regelen. Inderdaad wij kunnen hem beter begrijpen en duideliker hem zien dan zij, die met hem stonden in zijn strijd.*
>
> Better than any contemporaries could, [his] descendants can penetrate and understand what lived in the soul of a great man person who came before them. The everyday minutiae fall away and the lasting, the eternally strong, comes to the fore.

[20] "*Levenschets President Kruger*", *De Huisgenoot*, May 1916.

> But for one specific reason do his descendants know he who loomed large amongst his people, and that is for his ability to peer into the needs of the future. His temples might have carried the crown. His hand might have touched the sword and his shoulders been covered in the prophet's cloak. His task was not finished when his eyes became weak, the sword slipped out of the brave hand and the mouth forever held its peace – he who had spoken words of wisdom. He is there because his sharp eye looked towards the future and with devotion he listened to the voices that came to him from the future.
>
> This is the image we hold, of the warrior-statesman Paul Kruger, the seer, who peered into the future and was led by what he saw with his clairvoyant eye. Indeed, we can understand him better and more clearly than those who stood with him in his struggle.

Besides this prominence afforded to the late president in the launch issue, much hagiographic material was published about him throughout the first four decades of the magazine's existence. He was the subject of the first-ever commemorative issue published in the magazine's history.[21] Romantic historiographer Gustav S. Preller wrote two of the prominent articles in this issue. Kruger was also the subject of a 1944 article, in which his unknown contribution to preventing a looming civil war is discussed, as well as his contribution as negotiator in the Basotho war of 1858, his "marked influence on the outcome of events" (Drucker & Cathcart, 1994: 6) being reminiscent of the construction of the protagonist of the epic in the oral tradition. Another article on Kruger appears in a 1947 issue and is later published verbatim in the book *Paul Kruger: Simbool van 'n Volk* (*Kruger: Symbol of a Nation*) (Joubert 1983). The battle between Kruger and General Piet Joubert is discussed in a two-part series published in 1941. Although its authenticity is questioned, as Joubert (1983) points out, Kruger's last message before his death is also published in the magazine in 1942. In fact, E.J. Labuschagne (1948) notes that judging by *Huisgenoot*'s Kruger coverage, he could be regarded as "*the* folk hero" of the time.

As with many of the other individuals it profiled, the magazine celebrated Kruger not for one isolated characteristic but for a combination of noteworthy epic qualities traits including humility, military prowess, courage, piety and perseverance. The magazine sketches him as

[21] *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.

being raised humbly in a "*simple home and environment*",[22] despite the fact that, as Preller later argues, in an issue of 1925, he came from a prominent Afrikaans family.[23]

Noble ancestry is also, of course, often associated with the idea of the epic, albeit generally divine rather than merely mortal. Although the fledgling Afrikaans population lacked any form of nobility, the magazine, especially in its early issues, appears to compensate by referring to appropriate genealogies in its profiles in an attempt to show at least a semblance of noble lineage. In addition, it makes mention of any ancestor or even bloodline that could help to counter the Afrikaner's feeling of "marginalisation", to use Giliomee's (2003) term.

Poet Jan Celliers' profile in the September 1916 issue, for instance, includes an extensive section on the Celliers clan, apparently hailing from the French Huguenots who arrived in South Africa in 1770, with the comment: "*Wie dan ook afstam van 'n geslag, wat te fier en te sterk was om die nek vir oorheersing en onreg te buig, mag in regmatige trots daarop terugsien as deel van eie geskiedenis"* (Whoever comes from a generation that was too dignified and strong to bend the knee to domination and injustice may in justified pride look back thereupon as part of own history).[24]

In its construction of President Kruger as an *Epic Hero*, *Huisgenoot* is at pains to mention that his forebears, "*het almal min of meer bekend geword in die voorgeskiedenis van ons land*" (all became famous in our country's early history),[25] yet it places equal if not more emphasis on the humility that he acquired during his "simple" childhood, which remained evident throughout his life. As a 1925 edition of *Huisgenoot* describes it, as ZAR president he did not see himself as superior to his people, opening his porch for conversation with passers-by as he sat smoking his pipe every morning and even welcoming ordinary citizens into his home on special occasions such as birthdays, and entertaining them in simple and humble fashion.[26] A photograph of the president's last meeting on his *stoep* before his final departure from Pretoria provides visual evidence.[27] This very rare and anecdotal evidence, in the coverage, of the private space of the public figure is interesting, as it is a subtle suggestion of shifts in terms of the exposure of the private that would characterise the trajectory of fame during the remainder of the century. It is an early tentative surfacing of

[22] "*Levenschets President Kruger*", *De Huisgenoot*, May 1916.
[23] Preller, Gustav S., "*President Kruger*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[24] "*Levenschets. J.F.E. Celliers.*", *De Huisgenoot*, September 1916.
[25] Preller, Gustav S., "*President Kruger*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[26] M.E.R., "*'n Kaaplander in Transvaal in die Dae van die Republiek*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[27] *Die Huisgenoot*, 10 October 1947.

the notion of the private space in the coverage of a public figure, and appropriately it involves peripheral areas, reception rooms for entertaining, and the front porch, which essentially form the boundary between the public and the private space.

Even as a much-loved politician he was described as an "*eenvoudige Boereseun*" (a simple Afrikaner boy).[28] According to one of early *Huisgenoot*'s rare women contributors, M.E.R., whose memories of meeting the president and being a guest at his home are placed in the women's section of the magazine, his humility was striking from the fact that in the presence of ordinary citizens, he always seemed uncomfortable with his knightly order and state ribands. All this decoration, which can also be seen in many of the photographs published of him in the magazine, did not really seem to fit his more humble image, M.E.R. argues:

> *Of hy, soos die gewone man, geheg is aan uniforms, darem in die stilte daarvan gehou het, weet ek nie; maar dit het net so min by hom gepas as kokarte en strikke 'n rots kan versier. Maar ander mense was baie gesteld daarop, op die blink swart staatskoets met silwer beslag, en blou satyn bekleedsel van binne, en sulke dinge.*[29]
>
> If he, like the ordinary man, is attached to uniforms, at least secretly liked them, I don't know; but [the uniform] suited him as poorly as rosettes and ribbons can decorate a rock. But others dearly valued things, things like the shiny black state carriage with silver fittings, and blue satin upholstery inside, and such things.

These apparent indications of ordinariness and the simple life punctuate *Huisgenoot*'s predominantly hagiographic coverage of Kruger and other *Epic Hero* figures, with ordinariness most often associated with humility and belonging to a community.

Even though the regalia might not have appealed to Kruger, he is still widely celebrated as a soldier. By Kruger's own admission he was a good horseman and shot, as Preller reports,[30] who participated in battles against the local tribes, such as the Zulu and the Basotho, already at a tender age. Then there is also the stuff of legends… It is said that he killed his first lion at the age of thirteen, and at the same age he showed spiritual courage in the face of danger:

[28] Van Winter, P.J., *"Paul Kruger – Willem van Oranje"*, *Die Huisgenoot*, 10 October 1947.
[29] M.E.R., "*'n Kaaplander in Transvaal in die Dae van die Republiek*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[30] Preller, Gustav S., "*President Kruger*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.

> *Op dertienjarige leeftijd trekt hij reeds mede op een ekspeditie tegen 't kafferhoofd Selikats [...] De daden van de knaap zijn de daden van een man. Vastberaden is hij in 't gevaar en onverschrokkenheid wordt hem tot een tweede natuur.*[31]
>
> Already at age thirteen he went along on an expedition against the kaffer chief Selikats [...] These deeds do not become a boy but a man. He was determined in the face of danger, and fearlessness became second nature to him.

On more than one occasion writers for the magazine call him, "*vredemaker en vegsman*" (peacemaker and warrior),[32] with Grobbelaar arguing that he was instrumental in preventing a bloody civil war between the Free State and the Transvaal republics in 1859 and intervened during the Basotho wars of 1858 and 1865. He used battle rhetoric to great effect; "*Verdeel en heers!*" (Divide and rule!) were words the president apparently used with fondness, Preller writes:

> *Vergeet nooit de ernstige waarskuwing die ligt in 't woord: 'Verdeel en heers!' en maak dat dit woord op 't Afrikaanse volk nooit van toepassing zal kunnen zijn. Dan zullen ons nationaliteit en onze taal blijven bloeien*.[33]
>
> Never forget the serious warning that lies in the expression: 'Divide and rule!' and make as if this expression will never be applicable to the Afrikaans nation. Then our nationality and language will continue to bloom.

He gave the impression of power and steadfastness. "*Nog nooit het ek iemand gesien wat so die indruk van krag gemaak het nie, onwankelbare krag*" (Never before had I seen someone that made such an impression of power, unshakeable power), M.E.R. observes.[34] Not only was he powerful, he was also principled, a character trait that was noticed by another of the men celebrated in early issues of the magazine, former Afrikaner/Boer general and prime minister of the Union of South Africa from 1924 to 1939, Barry Hertzog:

> *"President Kruger was een en al beginsel," het genl. Hertzog een dag gesê. Hy kon dit wel gesê het; in die President was dit die eienaardige vastheid van beginsel wat*

[31] "*Levenschets President Kruger*", *De Huisgenoot*, May 1916.
[32] Coetzee, J. Albert, *"Politieke Partye in die Republieke"*, *Die Huisgenoot*, 21 February 1941; Grobbelaar, J.J.G., "*Paul Kruger en die Vrystaat: Susterrepubliek Meermale Groot Dienste Bewys*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 25 August 1944; and Van Winter, P.J., *"Paul Kruger – Willem van Oranje"*, *Die Huisgenoot*, 10 October 1947.
[33] Preller, Gustav S., "*President Kruger*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[34] M.E.R., "*'n Kaaplander in Transvaal in die Dae van die Republiek*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.

> *daardie besondere indruk op jou gemaak het. Sterk en vas, soos 'n rots – dit was die indruk wat by jou gebly het as jy hom gesien het.*[35]
>
> "President Kruger was all about principle," General Hertzog once said. He was justified in saying so; in the President it was the peculiar firm principled-ness that made that special impression on you. Strong and steadfast, like a rock – that was the impression he made on you when you saw him.

Judging by the select few Kruger images published by *Huisgenoot*, many people wanted to catch a glimpse of him in person or be present at one of his public addresses. As much is also suggested by the caption accompanying the black and white photograph of his last address to the people of Johannesburg, in August 1899 in Doornfontein, where hundreds arrived to watch him speak from a podium: "*President Kruger in al sy forsheid en krag*" (President Kruger in all his vigour and power).[36] Photographs in the Kruger commemorative issue also show how many people attended other events that offered the chance of seeing him in person (such as when he laid the cornerstone for the *Volksraadsgebou* (Volksraad building) in Pretoria in May 1889).[37]

Over the century, as the oral was overtaken by the written and eventually the visual tradition, still photography would gradually become the main medium employed by magazines to reveal and later expose private life, with diminishing word counts leaving space for the more generous use of visuals, which also improved in sharpness and quality, thanks to constantly improving photographic technology, and supply, due to evolving telecommunications technology. But at the beginning of the century, with photographs scarce and often of a questionable quality that was further eroded when reproduced in the printing process, what one could see was a heavier reliance on copy than images to convey messages and construct the *Epic Hero* that dominated early 20th-century popular magazine coverage. This implied using photographs to illustrate the main argument made in the copy. In the case of Kruger, this implied the publication of photographs that supported *Huisgenoot*'s portrayal of him as an *Epic Hero* for his people, an Afrikaner folk hero. Photographs of his public engagements taken by professionals generally supported this representation very well, as do the pictures that were taken following his death in exile in Switzerland in 1904. Photographs published by *Huisgenoot* show his mausoleum, funeral processions held for him in the streets of Den Haag (where he was first buried) and

[35] *Ibid*.
[36] *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[37] *Ibid*.

Rotterdam in the Netherlands, from where his body was transported back to South Africa by boat. There is an image of the local crowds that gathered to welcome the boat carrying his body, and also one of the large funeral processions at his final interment, on 16 December 1904, in the Heroes' Acre section of Pretoria's Church Street Cemetery. There is also a photograph showing the multitudes that arrived for the unveiling of his statue, by sculptor Anton van Wouw, on Pretoria's Station Square.[38] The majority of the relatively rare photographic evidence of President Kruger early *Huisgenoot* published shows him in public spaces (always), and in an elevated position compared the people who came to see him, on a podium, on stage, or on stairs, on a pedestal (in the case of busts and statues) and, even, in the final instance, his coffin atop the hearse, which of course adds to the notion of elevation, prominence and eminence often associated with the epic.

The Dutch-born Van Wouw is still widely regarded as the father of South African sculpture, with early *Huisgenoot* editor Markus Viljoen describing him in his memoirs *'n Joernalis Vertel* as, "by uitstek dié vertolker van die heroïeke tydperk in die Afrikaner se geskiedenis wat die Tweede Vryheidsoorlog voorafgegaan en met daardie worsteling geëindig het" (the interpreter par excellence of the heroic time-period in Afrikaner history that preceded the Second Boer War and ended with that battle) (Viljoen 1953: 150). Viljoen recalls how it was the gaze and the incredible passion of the Afrikaner/Boer commanders that he saw shining through in their portraits that is thought to have inspired Van Wouw to become an artist himself and leave the Netherlands to come and live among these people in South Africa. Harbouring a clear idea of what kind of figure warranted representation, he would use them as subjects for his painting and artworks for the rest of his life:

> As jong man het hy in Nederland portrette van die Boere gesien, en sy artistieke temperament is so deur hulle aangevuur dat hy dadelik besluit het om hom in die land van die indrukwekkende, gebaarde manne te vestig. Meermale het hy later aan ons vertel watter geweldige indruk die "prachtmensen" op hom gemaak het. Trouens, hy het hom só op die tydperk voor 1900 toegespits dat 'n mens die indruk gekry het dat alles wat daarna gekom het hom artistiek koud gelaat het. Alleen nog 'n enkele Boereleier uit daardie tydperk het hom later tot inspirasie gedien. (Viljoen 1953: 150)
>
> As young man in the Netherlands, he saw portraits of the Boers, and his artistic temperament was inspired by them to such an extent that he immediately decided to establish himself in the country of these impressive, bearded men. Many a time in

[38] *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.

later years he told us of the mighty impression these "beautiful people" made on him. In fact, he focused so intensely on the period before 1900 that one got the impression that everything that came thereafter left him cold artistically. Only a Boer leader from that time would serve as inspiration later in his life.

In addition to the statue of a standing President Kruger, Van Wouw also made a bust of him, which is described and reviewed in the *Huisgenoot* of August 1916. According to the anonymous author of the review, the Van Wouw bust of Kruger reveals the South African Republic president's tenacious character:

> *De wel gevormde mond met de sterk-forse bovenlip, drukt een onweerstaanbare wilskracht uit [...] Het is ons of samenvloeien in schone vereniging de karaktertrekken van sterk durven, van kinderlik geloven, van duldzaam lijden en van onwankelbaar doorzetten, die deze grote onder zijn volk bezielden. Het is een monument voor 't schoonste in 't Afrikaanse karakter en juist daarom een vertolking van 't echt-menselike, waardoor het leven zal als kunstwerk.*[39]
>
> The well-formed mouth with the strong, resolute upper lip, expressed an irrestistible willpower. It is as if the characteristics of strong daring, naïve belief, patient suffering and unshakeable perseverance, that this giant inspires in his nation, come together in pure unity. It is a monument to the most pure of the Afrikaans people and for this reason an expression of the truly human, which brings it to life as an artwork.

Kruger's perseverance is also underlined in Preller's ode in the 1925 commemorative issue, in which he writes, "*As Kruger iets wou doen, dan is dit deurgesit tot in die verste hoeke van die land, en die agterlikste agtervelder voel die beweging van sy wil. Daar word iets gedoen, daar kom 'n daad tot stand wat iedereen raak*" (If Kruger wanted something done, it was seen through into the farthest corners of the land, and even the most simple-minded yokel would feel the impact of his will. Something is being done, something is coming to pass that affects everyone).[40]

His greatness was prophesied by the Basotho Mountain King Moshesh, who apparently likened him to Voortrekker leader Andries Pretorius. "*Hierdie Boer* [Kruger] *sal nog eendag die plek van die groot Pretorius inneem*", Moshesh is said to have told one of the missionaries working in his kingdom (This Boer [Kruger] will one day take the place of the

[39] "*Zuid-Afrikaanse Kunst. Anton van Wouw*", *De Huisgenoot*, August 1916.
[40] Preller, Gustav S., "*President Kruger*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.

great Pretorius).[41] Yet his greatness was also visible to ordinary folk. M.E.R. wrote that the characteristic bags under the president's eyes indicated he was a "*great soul and an intellectual*".[42] "Soldier, scholar, horseman, he", wrote W.B. Yeats of his friend Major Robert Gregory in an elegy. This is an apt descriptor for *Huisgenoot*'s construction of Kruger.

Perhaps, in terms of how *Huisgenoot* represented Kruger, the most epic aspect of Paul Kruger's life was the fact that he channelled all his individual personality traits, including his courage and perseverance and humility and all the other "good" things into his own personal quest: that of fighting for the Afrikaner cause and elevating his people. Just like the protagonists of Homer's epics, President Kruger had a lifelong quest, and, as Preller explains,[43] it was for his people to achieve "*greatness and happiness*".

Without explicitly using the term 'charisma' to describe the ZAR president, early *Huisgenoot*'s posthumous appropriation of Kruger as a figure to bring about social cohesion in a tumultuous time in Afrikaner history has echoes of Max Weber's views on charismatic authority. Stefanie Halverson, Susan Murphy and Ronald Riggio (2004: 498) are among the scholars who have pointed out that, "Crisis has been an inherent part of charismatic leadership since Weber's original conceptualization of charismatic authority". Weber used the term charisma to describe:

> A certain quality of an individual personality, by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader. (Weber 1922/1947: 10)

Although the idea of charisma has theological origins, Weber is widely known for generalising it and based on his interpretation it has been applied to a variety of sociological contexts, including fame studies. David Marshall is one of the fame-studies scholars who has examined the meaning of the term charisma in the field. In his key text *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture* (1997: 20), Marshall points out that Weber's charismatic leader is a type of prophet who arises specifically at times when "extraordinary needs" are to be resolved.

---

[41] Grobbelaar, J.J.G., "*Paul Kruger en die Vrystaat: Susterrepubliek Meermale Groot Dienste Bewys*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 25 August 1944.
[42] M.E.R., "*'n Kaaplander in Transvaal in die Dae van die Republiek*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[43] Preller, Gustav S., "*President Kruger*", *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.

Marshall (1997: 21) further points to the theological meaning of charisma as "a "gift" from the grace of God". Tellingly, Kruger's calling was portrayed in *Huisgenoot* as a divine one on more than one occasion, with the anonymous article in the launch issue claiming:

> *De mens heeft een roeping op aarde en sterk zal de man zijn, die zijn biezondere roeping verstaat, die zijn plicht kent en zijn bestemming in 't komen en wisselen van alle dingen. En dit is het, wat tot zulk een diepe blijdschap stemt, wanneer we 't leven van Paul Kruger onderzoeken. Hij weet, dat hij geroepen is door God als een leidsman van zijn volk*.[44]
>
> Man has a calling on earth, and strong will be the man who understands his particular calling, who knows his responsibilities and his destination in the comings and goings of all things. And this is what creates such a deep joy when we examine the life of Paul Kruger. He knew that he was called by God to be the leader of his people.

Three decades later, the magazine still represented him in a similar way, with Van Winter writing in a 1947 issue,[45] "*die weë van God"* (the ways of God) were with Kruger, "*maar dat ook die man self geantwoord het op die roepstem wat tot hom gekom het*" (but the man himself also answered his calling).

A photograph of him delivering an address in Krugersdorp following the 1896 Jameson raid, with a ray of light falling on his face,[46] significantly only on his face amongst the handful of men appearing in the picture, also seems to be intended as symbolic of this divine calling. In his quest, there was much sacrifice, but it helped him to reach his full potential, Van Winter argues.[47]

Conclusion

Passion, courage, faith, perseverance, strength and the ability to overcome adversity: these and other ameliorative traits that merit representation are continuously emphasised in early editions of *Huisgenoot* in public figures ranging from pioneers and poets to pastors and politicians, most of them men and most of them deceased by the time their hagiographies appear in the magazine. From its inception, the magazine seems to appropriate the formula and literary devices governing the traditional epic poem and its protagonist for its readership, the fledgling Afrikaner nation, and make it contextually specific, re-presenting, in

[44] "*Levenschets President Kruger*", *De Huisgenoot*, May 1916.
[45] Van Winter, P.J., *"Paul Kruger – Willem van Oranje"*, *Die Huisgenoot*, 10 October 1947.
[46] *Die Huisgenoot*, 9 October 1925.
[47] Van Winter, P.J., *"Paul Kruger – Willem van Oranje"*, *Die Huisgenoot*, 10 October 1947.

most cases, *Epic Hero* figures who had already cemented this image in the collective imaginary and further amplifying this rhetoric.

There is a sense of shared values in the notion of the collective imaginary and figures that are commonly held as *Epic Hero figures* by the majority, even perhaps all, of the community or readership. *Huisgenoot* certainly made it clear from the start that it assumed and was guided in its editorial mission by a set of shared values, that it aimed to "*interpret*" that which was "living and working in the Afrikaner mind and heart" (*vertolken wat daar leeft en werkt in het afrikaanse hoofd en hart*) of its readership. The "*Opmerking van de Redaktie*" (Remarks from the Editorial Team) in the 1916 launch issue of the magazine explains unequivocally that the magazine interpreted readers' desire to be for "*al het goede in het nationale leven, die geschiedenis, overlevering en idealen van die hollandssprekende bevolking van Zuid-Afrika*" (all the good in the national life, the history, the traditions and customs and the ideals of the Dutch-speaking population of South Africa). "Good" and the "ideal" emerge as important themes here, assumedly shared values in the Afrikaans community and readership of the magazine at the time, judging by the remarks from the editorial team. Moreover, it is not surprising that *Epic Hero* figures from the community are subsequently selected to illustrate, even embody, these values.

As the early 20th century progressed, the magazine applied this contextually modified epic formula to a wider range of people, some of them not traditionally associated with this genre, including athletes, sportspeople and pioneering aviators. There were attempts to fit women into the mould, and posthumous profiles gradually made way for articles on the living.

Yet while this representation of fame dominated in *Huisgenoot* until the second half of the 20th century, another incarnation gradually started appearing in consumer magazines around the globe. Apparently influenced by the so-called 'film-fan' magazines that were used as instruments to market the films produced in Hollywood in the United States from as early as the 1910s, general consumer-magazine titles started to include a new category of fame that involved coverage of entertainers: actors mainly from film but also from theatre, as well as musicians. Also noticeable in this material was a shift in the why – or what it was that received attention in the magazine coverage, and a shift in the how – or the way in which this figure was covered, compared to the *Epic Hero* of the early 20th century.

While there were other local magazine titles that started following the international trend to include an element of entertainment-driven fame in their editorial mix, *Huisgenoot* was

rather slow on the uptake. From the 1930s onwards, *Huisgenoot* gradually started including coverage, first of general entertainment industry news and then, gradually, of prominent people within the industry, entertainers themselves, in keeping with international publishing trends. The first entertainer appeared on the cover in July 1931; it was Lydia Lindeque, an actor in a travelling-theatre piece called *Besigheid is Besigheid* (*Business is Business*).

Yet despite the relatively constant stream of (mostly foreign) entertainers putting in appearances to endorse a variety of beauty and other products in advertisements, this new representation of fame cannot be said to have become common in *Huisgenoot* until late in the 1960s.

This absence could perhaps, at least in part, be attributed to the Afrikaner-nationalist project's deep and lingering distrust of foreign influences of any kind, especially in the arena of leisure. This distrust is perfectly illustrated in the story that is told about Paul Kruger's reaction to a 1898 film recording of him walking out of his house and getting into a carriage on his way to the *Raadzaal* (council hall) of the ZAR. Leon van Nierop (2016) writes that this silent film clip of Kruger is unofficially regarded as the start of the South African film industry, an idea that is poignant, as it hints very tentatively and extremely presciently at the idea of the 'political celebrity' that would become an important theme in celebrity studies a century on. When Kruger was shown the clip, Van Nierop writes, he reacted in anger, not to the moving image but to the filmmaker's choice of the "ungodly" piano as accompanying instrument. He apparently only agreed to watch the film with organ accompaniment, which ensured the "appropriate sacred music" (Van Nierop, 2016: 19).

Huisgenoot, as the de facto mouthpiece of the Afrikaner-nationalist project, had to be seen to reject foreign influences. The magazine's opposition was, for instance, abundantly clear in its first regular film reviews, by Dr. Hans Rompel, who was possibly the first Afrikaans film critic. Besides *Huisgenoot*, Rompel also wrote for other *Nasionale Pers* (National Press, which would later be shortened to Naspers) publications such as *Die Burger* and *Die Brandwag*. He was quite vociferous about his opposition to "*volksvreemde*" (foreign-to-the-Afrikaner-nation) influences from the United States and Europe that "could corrupt the Afrikaner nation", Van Nierop (2016: 32) writes, and pleaded for the production of Afrikaans films about Afrikaner stories or traditions.

The magazine saw film as the ultimate foreign threat. Quoting Isabel Hofmeyr, Rob Nixon (1994: 55) notes how early *Huisgenoot*, "lashed out at the mish-mash of foreign commodities that was later christened and condemned as *bioskoopbeskawing* (bioscope or

cinema culture)". By no means did the magazine imply only film with its term *bioskoopbeskawing*. To the contrary, Nixon (1994) writes, the magazine warned that:

> A new foreign culture is ensconsed in powerful fortresses and citadels. With every new delivery by sea thousands of cheap English books are distributed throughout the country […] Our biggest daily papers, the cinemas, the school system, the language of our courts, the shops with their fashions and merchandise, the furniture in our houses are all bastions and agents of a foreign culture which claims for itself the right to overrun and conquer the world. (*Huisgenoot*, quoted in Nixon 1994: 55)

Yet it is interesting and certainly telling that the magazine uses cinema as synecdoche for general foreign influences threatening the autonomy and development of the Afrikaner nation. Since the magazine explicitly equates the cinema with unwanted influences on the Afrikaner, and by extension on its readership, it is not surprising that *Huisgenoot* lags behind its peers in terms of coverage of entertainment generally and, to be more specific, showbusiness personalities themselves.

The relative absence of this second incarnation of 20th-century fame in *Huisgenoot* up until the second half of the century, when this understanding already constituted large parts of the editorial mix of consumer magazines both locally, to some extent, and globally, can furthermore be attributed to the magazine's narrow focus on the relatively serious tasks of building the Afrikaner identity and establishing the Afrikaans language as official and distinctive from its Dutch origins. To aid it in its quest, the magazine can be said to have purposefully represented prominent Afrikaners as *Epic Hero* figures. By virtue of its editorial directive to drive the establishment of the Afrikaans language and culture, and therefore keep its content local, the magazine was rather limited in its choice of people and events to cover in terms of this new form of well-knownness, as the Afrikaans entertainment industry was still fairly young. Also, despite the first entertainer appearing on the cover as early as 1931, the magazine's tendency was to focus not so much on the individual entertainers and what it was about them that warranted coverage. Rather, the contribution of the actual entertainment product, such as the film or theatre production, for instance, towards the establishment of the Afrikaans language and culture is what was emphasised in the majority of the articles at this point.

A family magazine from its inception, *Huisgenoot* also perhaps eschewed entertainment-driven material, as it tended to be associated with sensationalism and for this reason did not

sit well with a series of generally conservative editorial staff members and most likely its loyal core readership.

Editor J.J. Spies had an aversion to films;[48] he acknowledged as much during an interview with Van Eeden (1981) and claimed to only cover films when they were highly newsworthy; in other words, the preference was for news on the end product, film, and not the individual actors who appeared in the film.

Spies' successor, D.C. de Villiers,[49] might not have harboured any ill feelings towards the film industry as such and even tells Van Eeden (1981) in an interview that he chose to introduce entertainment as one of the new functions of the magazine during his time as editor-in-chief, yet the magazine only occasionally covered individual entertainers during his tenure. Senior editorial staff member Fred le Roux, who left the magazine in 1949, explained that during his time at the magazine the intention was most definitely not to supply "prikkelende leesstof" (sensational material). In a 1985 interview with Lizette Rabe, Le Roux seems to hint at the distinction between the kind of well-knownness *Huisgenoot* championed as compared to other consumer titles at the time:

> Ons het nie smaak gehad aan die Britse koningshuis of sterretjies of die private lewe van mense wat opgedis word (met die implikasie mense slaap by mekaar nie). Ons het oor vroue en mense geskryf, maar dit was mense wat iets bereik het. (Rabe, in Slabbert 1993:98–99)

> We did not have any taste for the British monarchy or stars or dishing up the private lives of people (implying that people are sleeping with each other). We wrote about women and people, but they were people who achieved something.

Yet an interest in stars of the silver screen and also, crucially, in private lives, and an understanding of the commercial possibilities thereof, is exactly what had a proper grip on other titles in the consumer-magazine industry by the middle of the 20th century, when *Huisgenoot* was still upholding its preference for the *Epic Hero* figure. It is this new entertainment-driven construction of fame, which differs from the *Epic Hero* that came before yet is still characterised by a number of elements associated with the heroic although not the epic that is explored in the following chapter, with a specific focus on how it was

[48] Spies was editor of *Die Huisgenoot* from 1951 to 1959.
[49] De Villiers was editor of *Die Huisgenoot* from 1959 to 1965.

appropriated locally by *Drum* magazine to be contextually specific in South Africa around the middle of the 20th century.

Chapter 2:
The *Star* rises in South Africa: *Drum* magazine in the 1950s

On a superficial level, a move in editorial direction from covering pioneers fighting wild beasts in the wilderness to film actors being wooed on screen seems like an enormous leap to make in the space of a few decades. And in a sense it *is* a significant shift: from a figure that resembles, in large part, the protagonist of epic poetry to what is, in essence, an entertainer. But that is if only *who* they are is considered during the process of analysis. When one looks more carefully into who was covered and examines which character traits are represented in the coverage, the movement from one understanding of fame to the next suddenly does not seem that substantial.

Although there are, of course, differences in what it is that they do, both the *Epic Hero* of the early 20th century and the entertainment personality that starts dominating magazine coverage towards the 1950s are essentially 'public figures'. The term is not usually associated with entertainers but rather reserved for people 'in office' or officials in public service. But in both cases, their established status as actors in the public space is arguably what motivates the magazine staff to consider and ultimately select them for inclusion. Note that the magazines essentially act as consumers of the public figure; both the *Epic Hero* that surfaces in early 20th-century coverage and the entertainer are selected on account of their already established public image.

When one closely examines and compares the magazine coverage of these successive figures, a significant difference does indeed emerge: in the publicisation of and preference for details of the entertainment personality's private, in addition to public, life. Yet a close reading and comparison of the magazine texts, and a careful examination of what specific details, what characteristics and actions, are selected for coverage, reveal a certain logic and a continuity between the successive understandings in magazine representations of fame in the first half of the 20th century.

Specifically, there is a sense of being a model, or an example, which permeates the magazine coverage that surfaces the *Epic Hero* and the entertainer who immediately succeeds him. At this point, it is important to again remind ourselves that the general absence of elements that might compromise the image of the entertainer as a model is a specific characteristic of how famous people were represented in *South African magazines* and can certainly not be extended to a the wider history of fame. In other words, magazine

coverage of entertainers around the middle of the 20th century might have by and large eschewed references to scandal and notoriety, yet this does not mean that these elements were not present in the history of fame. On the contrary, as Barry King (2014) reminds us, scandal and notoriety can be traced back much further, with gossip and rumour characterising court society and especially famous literary figures of the Romantic period, Lord Byron perhaps the most pre-eminent amongst them. There is a definite sense of infamy in Hugh Trevor-Roper's description of court society in 16th century Europe. He writes:

> It is a fascinating spectacle, the rise of the princes in sixteenth century Europe […] Their dynasties may be old, and yet their character is new: they are more exotic, more highly coloured than their predecessors. They are versatile, cultivated men, sometimes bizarre, even outrageous: they bewilder us by their lavish tastes, their incredible energy, their ruthlessness and panache. (Trevor-Roper in Van Krieken 2012: 18)

Yet despite the idea of notoriety being an undeniable element in the history of fame long before the 20th century, magazines in the early parts of this century, and certainly the South African titles I consulted, chose to look the 'other way', focusing their coverage of famous people on exemplariness and behaviour that was to be revered, not reviled. Accordingly, the people included in coverage were selected because they displayed these admirable qualities.

For the entertainer, this exemplariness came about as a result of the deliberate and coordinated marketing efforts of the Hollywood motion-picture industry in the United States in the first half of the 20th century, a system that has greatly influenced global understandings of fame in the 20th century.

As has been extensively documented in media, film and cultural studies literature, this marketing system, firstly, relied on so-called 'typecasting'[50] leading performers for their various film roles. Through such rigid categorisation, the performers slowly emerged as prime examples or models. In his seminal work simply entitled *Stars*, Richard Dyer (1979: 53–68) identifies mainstream basic social types such as the "good Joe", "the tough guy" and the "pin-up girl", as well as figures deliberately fashioned to be independent or subversive in some way, including the "rebel" and the "independent woman". In this sense, the idea of 'exemplariness' was perhaps further strengthened by the fact that during the early 20th

[50] For more on categorisation of social types in films, see for instance Dyer (1979), Jimmie Reeves (1988) and Peter Bogdanovich (2004).

century, on-screen characters (film parts) are for the most part also scripted to exhibit model behaviour, as Fred Inglis (2010) argues:

> The fashioned star was by and large kept away from the wrongdoing in the action (except for those deliberately invented, like Jimmy Cagney, as gangsters). The beautiful woman might hold out the promise of sexuality […] but her passion must be sincere and her abandon offscreen. [Carey] Grant, John Wayne, Errol Flynn were all strikingly handsome, manly, alluring, but their emotional fulfillment as part of the story was as firmly confined by decorum and propriety as the president's. (Inglis 2010: 187–188)

Most importantly, however, the publicisation of entertainment personalities' private lives, which were (mostly) manufactured by the film studios to which they were contracted, at first appeared to be complementary to their onscreen, or public, personae. Tellingly using the word 'hero', Richard DeCordova (1991: 27) writes that at this early stage in US film history, "The real hero behaves just like the real hero". The notion of complementary on- and off-screen, or public and private, lives defines the notion of the 'model'. Through industry-wide marketing efforts covering both their on- and off-screen personalities, film performers came to be viewed, ultimately, as eminent examples of a set of social types. In fact, they appeared not only as prime examples but also as having perfected a certain kind of type and, by extension, a complementary kind of lifestyle even in their private capacity.[51]

Because the *Epic Hero* and its performer successor share an underlying sense of the perfect and the exemplary, they also both seem to rely on a kind of shared feeling of admiration in their audiences. In the previous chapter reference was made to the element of veneration and also elevation evident in the phrase "Great Men on a Pedestal", as Henderson (2005) calls them, who dominate magazine representations of fame in the early 20th century. Henderson uses the word 'devotion', with its connotations of religion, to describe the kind

[51] As much is clear from Toll's (1982: 186) unpacking of the allure of the real-life Hollywood coupling of the on-screen social types of "boyfriend" Douglas Fairbanks and "sweetheart" Mary Pickford: "While he reigned on screen as the dashing, swashbuckler king of adventure, off screen Fairbanks lived out an even more fantastic fairy tale when in 1920 America's boyfriend married Mary Pickford, America's sweetheart – a dream wedding only possible in Hollywood", Toll (1982: 186) writes. "The storybook couple – the boy next door and the girl next door – held court at their palatial Pickfair estate like American royalty […] Fairbanks […] lived out the fantasies of men and boys all over America in the sports-crazy 1920s when he sparred with Jack Dempsey, served a tennis ball to Bill Tilden, and pitched to Babe Ruth. Magazines and newspapers filled their pages with stories about Pickford and Fairbanks. Their fashions, cars, and pets, her cosmetics and hairstyles, his suntan and athleticism, all influenced by an American public that relished every tidbit of information it could get about the stars known simply as "Doug and Mary" […] Pickford and Fairbanks continued to pack movie theaters by portraying idealized, innocent images of an earlier time".

of admiration these men instilled amongst their followers. The Great Men's immediate entertainer successors continued to inspire wonderment, albeit arguably of a different kind, and, I think, an even greater sense of elevation. Their followers were classed as fanatics, or fans for short, a word that, interestingly, also has religious connotations (with etymology referring to a temple, divine inspiration and frenzy). This association with the sacred emphasises the notion of the exemplary.

The fanaticism of the cinema-going public was taken full advantage of, by way of fan clubs, but mainly also through the film-fan magazines or 'fanzines', created and produced by the Hollywood film industry to market their motion pictures mainly through purporting to offer coverage and evidence of the private lives of their contracted actors. *Photoplay* and *Motion Picture Story* both launched in 1911, and both claimed to be the first fanzine. Joshua Gamson (2001) writes of how *Photoplay*, *Modern Screen* and *Silver Screen* boasted a combined circulation of half-a-million readers by the 1930s, and their popularity can be read as testimony to the enthusiasm of the cinema-going public. Launched on 7 August 1915, *Stage and Cinema* was one of the first fanzines to appear in South Africa. Van Nierop (2016) explains how the magazine was sold in entrance halls to film theatres such as the chain of fifty bioscopes owned by the American businessman and immigrant Isadore William Schlesinger.

Fanzines and fan clubs, and to a lesser extent also posters and strategic public appearances by the film performers themselves, formed the basic framework of the US film production studios' calculated entertainer-focused marketing system dating back to the early 20th century, very shortly after *Huisgenoot*'s 1916 launch. This coordinated industry-wide effort was the first to purposefully use the word 'star', which conjures up notions of luminosity and elevation, to label the contracted film performers.[52] Florence Rogers and Michael Real (1994: 204, original emphasis retained) note how, "The tag *star* indicates something high up and far away, something we reach for […] Film stars are literally up there on the screen and out of reach through the nature of the projected image."

[52] The Hollywood film industry might have commercialised the term, but the word 'star' had been associated with entertainers as far back as the 1700s, which is reportedly the first time it was used in this way, to denote a stage actor whose presence in a production ensured all seats in the theatre house would be filled. Theatre and opera might have produced some of the earliest performers who could be classified as stars, as Janet Staiger (1991) and Ellis (1982) have claimed. And, as Henderson (2005), Drake and Miah (2010) and Jacob Smith (2010) write, "showman" P.T. Barnum, with his pioneering efforts promoting circus personalities as early as the mid-19th century, could perhaps be seen as the inventor of a specific way of using individual entertainers to market productions and sell tickets that was later appropriated by the US film-production industry.

On the one hand the nature of film and the projected image creates a sense of distance, yet on the other it ensures a particular kind of intimacy, making actors appear almost lifelike and yet, simultaneously, larger than life. Moving-picture technology also allowed for a sense of luminosity as well as intimate camera angles, which influenced the kind of intimacy the audience members could share with the actors, Marshall (1997) argues. The cinematic experience itself, the fact that the audience saw performers "from afar, and much larger than life in an oversized [usually darkened] room in the public sphere" (Meyerowitz 1994: 65), also contributed to their followers experiencing them up close yet also larger than life itself. As Joshua Meyerowitz (1994: 65) writes of the public cinematic experience:

> Audiences could see the facial expression and body movements of performers with greater clarity than from a front row seat at a live performance and individual performers could gain a following larger than would be humanly possible through a lifetime of live appearances. Early filmmakers were taken by surprise by the strong emotional attachment that developed between performer and audience.

2.1 Stardom the *Drum* way

So through the very medium of film, these actors appeared simultaneously within and out of reach. Paul Rixon (2011) writes how this concurrent distance and intimacy in the film-watching encounter creates a constant tension between a kind of ordinary intimacy and extraordinary distance. Perceived intimacy is further perpetuated through the high circulation of public images, and the proximity becomes both psychological and physical.

The attraction of this constant reciprocity between perceived notions of the ordinary and extraordinary is taken advantage of by subsequent extension into the publicised private life of the stars. Dyer (1979) calls it the "ordinary-extraordinary 'paradox'" and identifies it as lying at the heart of stardom, with "the notion that stars are constructed as being 'ordinary' (like 'us'), yet simultaneously distinctive and 'special'" (Holmes 2005: 10). The play between these two contrasting terms has subsequently been interpreted in a variety of different ways in film-, cultural- and media-studies literature.

In the early stages of the Hollywood's marketing machine, widely called the 'star system', the ordinary-extraordinary paradox seems to be understood in the literature as at times representative of the dichotomy between intimacy and distance, the everyday and the distinctive, or the private and the public sphere, and the actor's image comes to represent a play between these elements. Dyer (1979: 22) defines 'stars' as those performers who have

"an existence in the world independent of their screen/'fiction' appearances"; he also defines stardom as "an image of the ways stars live" (Dyer 1979: 39). Edgar Morin (1960) argues that there is a reciprocal relationship between the two. "Once the film is over", he writes, "the actor becomes an actor again, the character remains a character, *but from their union is born a composite creature who participates in both, envelopes them both: a star*" (Morin, 1960: 39, original emphasis retained). John Ellis (1982) defines a 'star' as "a performer in a particular medium whose figure enters into subsidiary forms of circulation, and then feeds back into future performances" (Ellis, 1982: 91). Seemingly underlying all these different definitions is the understanding that stardom necessarily presupposes a 'transcendence' of professional performance, as Evans (2005) argues, in order to create a very specific allure. Marshall (1997) calls this allure "aura" and Dyer (1991) calls it "charisma", both terms that have come to have different overtones today.

In his seminal essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, Walter Benjamin, of course, expresses his scepticism of the aura of the film performer, especially as it is built up within the film-production industry:

> The film responds to the shriveling of the aura [of the screen actor] with an artificial build-up of the "personality" outside the studio. The cult of the movie star, fostered by the money of the film industry, preserves not the unique aura of the person but the "spell of the personality," the phony spell of a commodity. (Benjamin, in Arendt 1968: 231)

Yet Dyer compares the notion of charisma, as developed by Max Weber in political theory, to charisma in the phenomenon of stardom. Dyer quotes Weber's definition of charisma: "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman or at least superficially exceptional qualities" (Dyer 1991: 57), and also that of E.A. Shils:

> The charismatic quality of an individual as perceived by others, or himself lies in what is thought to be his connection with (including possession by or embedment in) some *very central* feature of man's existence and the cosmos in which he lives. The centrality, coupled with intensity, makes it extraordinary. (Dyer 1991: 57, original emphasis retained)

Important to note for the moment, however, is that in early understandings of stardom, reminiscent of magazine representations surfacing the *Epic Hero* in the early 20th century,

the notion of the extraordinary is most often, in fact almost exclusively, linked to positive elements, greatness and an abundance of good qualities and actions.

Of all the elements associated with stardom, it is this idea of the constant interaction between the ordinary and the extraordinary that the South African magazine *Drum* may have seen as a golden, and totally irresistible, opportunity very soon after its launch in 1951. The cultural landscape, together with *Drum*'s idiosyncratic editorial mix, tone and style, allowed for the exaggeration of these two elements, both the ordinary and the extraordinary, and in the process for a kind of optimised or 'superstar' figure to emerge in the magazine's representations of fame.

Early *Drum*'s appropriation of the Hollywood star system is an interesting point to consider given Olivier Driessens's (2012: 643) reminder that when it comes to fame:

> we should not ignore the differences between individualistic and collectivist cultures, western and non-western societies, and their implications for the value and ways of achieving [fame] therein. Also every culture or nation has its own heroes, stars […] Most of these people's fame does not reach beyond cultural or national boundaries, which makes celebrity culture essentially a plural and heterogeneous phenomenon. Hence it could best be described as a patchwork of several small and some larger celebrity cultures with differing degrees of overlap.

The allure and influence of the at the time overwhelmingly white Hollywood films to *Drum*'s black South African readership of the 1950s might seem doubtful, but the literature points out just how pervasive Western culture was on the editorial formula of *Drum*. Lindsay Clowes (2001: 9), for instance, considers the magazine's first beauty competition, held in 1952, and comes to the conclusion that, in the process, *Drum* recast "'inappropriate' African notions of beauty […] to fit into a modern, gendered, western ideal". Particularly interesting in this regard is the conclusion Antje Rauwerda (2007) comes to after specifically looking at the advertising in *Drum* from 1951 to 1959. Stardom is connected to whiteness, she finds, "undermining some of the magazine's apparent resistance to racism in its celebration of African artists", she writes (Rauwerda, 2007: 400).

And yet, despite the colour divide, the mostly white Hollywood film stars seemed to hold an even larger appeal, to be perceived as even more extraordinary, amongst black South African audiences in the 1950s than they were by US audiences at the time. For the local black viewership in the 1950s, the film actor may have represented everything it did for the

American audience, and a lot more. As Tim Couzens (1985) and Gwen Ansell (2004) write, the performing arts, specifically film but also music and dance, created a break in the monotony of the bleak existence of SA's black population in the 1950s.

Of all the genres, film possibly held the greatest allure, for the opportunity it created amongst audiences with limited lives to escape and imagine a different reality for themselves. Film audiences could partake of "the vicarious pleasures of identification with and exploration of the realm of the extraordinary", Behroze Gandhy and Rosie Thomas (1991: 107–108) note. Film's extraordinariness is exceptionally attractive and seductive, as it could be linked to "the possibility of a 'better' life in early apartheid South Africa", Lindiwe Dovey and Angela Impey (2010: 60) argue, adding that, "The Hollywood films that were screened encouraged middle-class aspirations, and inspired black viewers to imagine themselves as international, bourgeois subjects – stylishly dressed, well-spoken, and, most importantly, modern".

Film, of course, also offered pure escapism from a limited life. "The lives that the blacks were living were pretty appalling. One could not wait for the revolution to come along and rescue one from this kind of impoverished life. So anything that came along to provide the fantasy was welcome", *Drum* staff writer Lewis Nkosi comments about the cinema-going experience in Peter Davis' 1996 documentary film *Darkest Hollywood: Cinema in Apartheid* (quoted in Alegi 2004: 87).

It is interesting and important to consider that something similar could be said of the magazine-reading experience itself, especially for black South Africans at the time. Sonja Laden (1997: 125) argues that, "[C]onsumer magazines and the cultural commodities they recommend [are] valid ways of enabling people to imagine as plausible alternative realities which may be structurally opposed to their existing reality". In other words, one could say that it is on two counts that film performers became the *de facto* representatives of fantasy and promise, especially for black South Africans living under apartheid: by virtue of their presence in the medium of print in addition to their presence in the medium of film.

Anecdotal evidence abounds of the magnetic appeal of the cinema-going experience itself amongst black audiences during this time in South Africa and also, in rare instances, of the specific charisma of particular on-screen film characters. Anthony Sampson (2004) recalls how audience members would copy film characters, use lines from the movies as part of their patois, and recreate outfits they saw on screen. *Drum* staff writer Can Themba, for instance, tells Sampson, his editor at *Drum* that, following the release in SA cinemas of the

1948 film *The Street With No Name*: "[S]ales of Benzedrine rocketed. Everybody munched apples. All the *tsotsis* [petty criminals] wore those raincoats" (Sampson, 2004: 81) after the main criminal in the movie, Stiles. Sampson (2004) also mentions how a local gang tellingly called 'the Americans' became known for wearing 'Bogarts', trousers close to those worn on screen by iconic leading man Humphrey Bogart.

Apparently leaning heavily on the image of antagonists in the Hollywood films that were screened in local cinemas at the time, the gangster figure was an important one in 1950s *Drum*, in the magazine's coverage of both real and imagined characters. It is also an important figure to consider briefly in terms of the trajectory of 20th-century fame being explored here, as it straddles two categories and could even be said to foreshadow a third. As a film character, the *Drum* gangster has clear links with the *Star* figure. But, despite the notion of gangsterism implying transgression (foreshadowing the famous figure emerging in magazines around the turn of the 20th century), the *Drum* gangster also has elements of the heroic. In his discussion of the "tough guy" figure in 1950s *Drum*, Mac Fenwick (1996) even uses the oxymoron "gangster-hero" as a descriptor. Quoting Sampson, Fenwick (1996: 625) explains that, "The world of the Hollywood gangster was, in effect, the reality that most urban blacks faced daily […] It should come as no surprise then, that urban blacks identified so closely with the heroes of a movie-screen world that so resembled their own."

Because of what they came to represent amongst the local black cinema-going audience, the gangsters, as well as other characters in American films, ultimately seemed to be regarded as particularly extraordinary, to have a sense of heightened extraordinariness about them. But this notion of the extraordinary associated in the first instance with film actors could also be extended to other entertainers in the performing arts, and especially to local jazz musicians in 1950s black South Africa. With these musicians, there was a sense of extraordinariness in terms of their talent, which developed despite the limited opportunities for black people at the time. In addition, their relocation (into exile or in search of better opportunities for their arts), also gave their fans a sense of exotic distance despite the intimacy that came with their being born in South Africa.

But these local jazz players and singers also emerged as extraordinary in terms of what they represented and how they represented it. A description of a scene in a jazz hall and how the musicians expressed "the uncertainty and restlessness of urban life which rejects the Negro" in a 1976 essay by Es'kia Mphahlele reminds one of Shils's argument that charisma is the connection with "some *very central* feature of man's existence and the cosmos in which he

lives. The centrality, coupled with intensity, makes it extraordinary" (Shils in Dyer 1991: 57, original emphasis retained).

The sense of the extraordinary that Hollywood emphasised in its actors could also be transferred to sportsmen: soccer players and boxers in particular. Their measurable success and triumph on the playing field and in the boxing ring was extremely inspiring, especially amongst black South Africans under apartheid, as Alegi (2004) and Kasia Boddy (2008) have noted.

Drum's coverage of local sports and music personalities dovetailed comfortably with its coverage of prominent African-Americans. "Given the frailty of South Africa's black professional classes, *Drum* plundered many of its images of upward mobility from African-America", writes Nixon (1994: 29). "Duke Ellington, Louis Armstrong, Althea Gibson, and Joe Louis all received star treatment, alongside features like 'High Life in Harlem,' 'Negro University' […] and a regular column, 'Negro Notes from USA'". By virtue of being out of reach, the African-Americans represented in *Drum* had an extraordinary element to them.

But, crucially, the construction of the *Star* relied as much on a notion of the ordinary, developed through publicising the private life of the entertainer. The staff writers and photographers of 1950s *Drum* were exceptionally well placed to advance notions of the ordinary, perhaps not as much in coverage of the international entertainers, but particularly in terms of local personalities. A variety of factors contributed to their being in this position, not least of which was their living amongst and socialising with local performers (amongst the other characters that were covered in the magazine) in Johannesburg, its suburbs and its townships. "Over the years, politicians, musicians, overseas journalists, actors, conmen and gangsters all made *Drum* their rendezvous", former *Drum* editor Stan Motjuwadi (1982: 74), for instance, writes. "The Classic Smiles, The White House, Suzie's and The Summit Talks […] were the shebeens where we got together".

Because they regularly got to socialise with the entertainers selected for coverage in the magazine, these *Drum* writers had a perfect vantage point from which to observe elements of ordinariness and extraordinariness, which they would then weave into their representation. The ordinary-extraordinary divide is already evident in the very first issue of *Drum*, in this profile piece of local pennywhistler Willard Cele.[53] The extensive citation here is necessary to illustrate how the ordinary, and evidently bleak, SA township life, including

[53] "*Success Story*", *The African Drum*, March 1951.

long queues for public transport, bumpy roads, disability, shortage of money, is juxtaposed with unbelievable, extraordinary success:

> *I'm so surprised — I can't believe it! I never thought I could make up something out of such a small toy instrument — but it's very nice!" So replied 20-year-old Willard Cele, of Johannesburg, when asked how he felt about his sudden rise to stardom.*
>
> *The story of Willard Cele's meteoric rise to fame reads exactly like a fairy tale. Only a few months ago he was standing in a long queue in Alexandra Township waiting for a bus. To pass the time he started playing his flageolet to the amusement of everybody around.*
>
> *Suddenly a car bumping along the road drew up and the owner listened intently. He was obviously intrigued by the haunting appeal of Willard's "Penny Whistle Blues". Mr. Swanson, Director of Swan Films, immediately left his car and followed the thin thread of melody which led him to crippled Willard Cele. There and then he decided to include Willard and his music in the South African film "The Magic Garden".*
>
> *These two melodies "Penny Whistle Blues" and "Penny Whistle Boogie" have now been recorded, and are creating a big stir both in Johannesburg and London.*
>
> *Pennington Richards (one of the best lighting cameramen in the world today) who filmed "The Magic Garden" says that members of the British film world who heard the record had been greatly intrigued by the weird and wonderful rhythm.*
>
> *Willard Cele is still at school studying for his Junior Matriculation. In his spare time and at week-ends he limps across the Observatory Golf Course earning extra cash as a "caddie".*
>
> *Unfortunately he can no longer play sport. Four years ago during a game of football he broke his left leg and is now a permanent cripple. But he concentrated more than ever on his music and found happiness and contentment in the magic of melody and song.*
>
> *His future plans are to study music and to become an expert clarinet player. So here's good luck to Willard Cele, the African youth who never learned a note of music, but who is now bringing joy to thousands of music lovers everywhere — and, we hope, some hard cash to himself.*

Besides making reference to the actual terms "stardom" and "meteoric", the article also contains a fair number of other references that characterise this understanding of fame: magic and fairy tales, a rags-to-riches story and a chance discovery of talent by a prominent

agent that led to fame both locally and internationally. What is more, the link with the world of film further prepares the way for the emergence of the *Star* in *Drum*.

Although the Willard Cele profile in the launch issue of *Drum* might include its terminology, the evidence of a private life, a key characteristic of the construction of the Star, is rather sparse. This sparseness makes it difficult for any kind texture to be brought into the coverage, and consequently there are only two aspects to Willard that are emphasised: the poverty and the possibility, the rags and the riches. Given the reference to triumph over one's circumstances, there could even be said to be a sense of the heroic to be traced alongside the notion of the *Star* in this profile, making Willard a transitional figure.

The same applies to the coverage of legendary black American boxer Sugar Ray Robinson, in a selection of captioned photographs seemingly showing a day in his life.[54] The notion of the heroic is inherent in the sport of boxing, especially in the context of 1950s black South Africa. The boxing match serves as a "metaphor for opposition – the struggle between two bodies before an audience […] representing opposing qualities, ideas and values", Boddy (2008: 7) writes. But Sugar Ray does not emerge only as a sporting hero, as there is an allusive indication of his life away from the boxing ring. The small gallery includes photographs of him kissing his wife goodbye in the morning while she is still in bed, in the barber's chair, training in the gym and relaxing at home. Besides the captions explaining the content of the pictures, the only other piece of copy on the page provides details of the most recent fight between Sugar Ray and British boxer Randolph Turpin. Sugar Ray had won the fight, a rematch that had taken place in New York in front of 60 000 fans, and been crowned world middleweight boxing champion. Widely known as a particularly physical pugilist, he knocked Turpin out in ten rounds to claim the world middleweight title a mere three months after Turpin had won it in London.[55] According to *Drum*, the referee stopped the fight after Robinson "let loose" on Turpin, knocking him down and then pushing him onto the ropes and unleashing a series of punches.

Although this coverage of Sugar Ray is by no means extensive in terms of column inches and word count, it succeeds in typecasting him and illuminating the contrast between his private and his public life. He is shown to be a tough champion boxer in the former, but also a tender partner, kissing his wife goodbye, and 'homebody', who chooses to relax at home rather than living the high life. In addition, he understands the importance of a groomed

[54] "*Sugar Ray Robinson: A Day in Pictures*", *Drum*, October 1951.
[55] Regular *Drum* readers might have been well aware of the details of the London fight, as first-person accounts of the encounter by both fighters had been published in the issue of September 1951.

physical appearance, as an image of him in a barbershop appears to indicate. To use Dyer's (1979: 111–113) terminology, the *Drum* coverage shows Robinson's private life "resisting" his public life. Furthermore, the inclusion of the image of Robinson training in the gym could be read as an indication that his success relies on more than just raw talent, one of the elements linked with the notion of the extraordinary in stardom; it also relies on hard work. Much of the literature on 20th-century fame and stardom includes a discussion of whether famous individuals were deserving of fame or not; in other words, there is an emphasis in the literature on the meritocracy of fame.

The seemingly superficial, photograph-driven coverage of Sugar Ray in *Drum* offers much to capture the imagination of the reader: his legendary physicality as a boxer must have held some appeal amongst a readership at the receiving end of the discrimination of the apartheid system, but then the coverage juxtaposes the brutality of the sport with evidence of tenderness towards his wife. In addition, the idea of perfection in expressed in his 'perfect' physique, introduced by way of photographs of him in the ring and dressed only in boxer shorts and showing his naked torso, and also going about his grooming routine. All of these contrasting elements that are suggested in the coverage combine to arguably make Sugar Ray a seriously compelling figure: extreme, legendary and extraordinary. Perhaps Sugar Ray embodied some "*very central* feature" of the black South African existence, to refer back to Shils's description of charisma (in Dyer, 1991: 57) again. The kind of figure that emerges from this *Drum* coverage embodies Boddy's (2008: 20) argument that boxing is "a productive way to imagine conflict", as it inextricably mixes "high decorum and low cunning […], beauty and damage […], rhetoric and bodily fluids".

Although telling, this sparse coverage of Robinson's private life could be said to be representative of the type of documentation early *Drum* affords the film actors, sportspeople and musicians it regularly covers and in a certain way reminds one of the very early days of the Hollywood film industry. In a technique reminiscent of audience references to the corporal features (the 'girl with the curls', the 'fat guy' etc.) of as-yet anonymous Hollywood actors of the early 20th century, *Drum* also regularly identifies personalities by their physical traits; boxer Johannes 'Jolting Joe' Maseko is for example described as "*the 27-year-old Swazi with the flashing teeth*".[56]

Lacking the intimacy that will come to characterise later 20th-century representations of fame in the magazines, these kinds of almost impersonal references to entertainers are

[56] *Drum*, June 1951.

arguably the result of *Drum*'s original editorial directive.[57] Under this editorial vision, entertainment content was, for the most part, eschewed in favour of coverage of what were seen as the more 'traditional' affairs in the local black community. Market research conducted shortly after the magazine was launched revealed that readers found *Drum* much too traditionalist and focused on rural readers. "'Ag, why do you dish out that stuff man? […] Tribal music! Tribal history! Chiefs! We don't care about chiefs!'" one of readers of early *Drum* apparently told editor Anthony Sampson (2004: 7). The interview was conducted at the Bantu Men's Social Centre, one of the few cultural and entertainment centres in Johannesburg accessible to black people at the time and a venue apparently favoured by *Drum*'s entertainment writers. And then, tellingly, the ultimate desire of the *Drum*'s early readership surfaces:

> "*Give us jazz and film stars, man*! We want Duke Ellington, Satchmo, and hot dames! […] You can cut out this junk about kraals and folk tales and Basutos in blankets – forget it! You're just trying to keep us backward, that's what! Tell us what's happening right here, man, on the Reef!" (Sampson, 2004: 7, emphasis added)

Consequently, not even a decade into *Drum*'s existence, the magazine started including more content on entertainment and, importantly, offering much more extensive coverage of the private lives of its entertainers. Details are divulged about childhood, education, fashion preferences and partners and spouses, amongst many other things. All the while, the contrast between the ordinary and extraordinary remains a quintessential ingredient in coverage of the famous figure, and it is especially significant as it is seen, as Sampson (2004: 96) reveals, as representative of "the sharp duality of African life, which touched everyone".

Sampson (2004) makes this comment in reference to the *Drum* market research, and specifically which photographs the readership seemed to see as most compelling:

> The African boxing champ, stepping under the ropes into the ring, with a sea of black faces gazing behind him, smiling confidently, swathed in a silk dressing-gown, a

[57] One of the early *Drum* editors, Anthony Sampson, describes the original formula as focused on "African poems and stories; articles on 'Music of the Tribes' and 'Know Yourselves', recounting the history of Bantu tribes; instalments of *Cry, the Beloved Country*; features about religion, farming, sport and famous men; and strip cartoons about Gulliver and St Paul" (Sampson 2004: 3). Tellingly, the note from the editor in the magazine's launch issue ("*Message from an African*", March 1951) reads, "*We thought it would be a good idea, and in keeping with the tradition of such events, if the first number of our magazine could begin with A Message from an Important Person. There was a wide choice before us – Governors, Cabinet Ministers, High Commissioners, African Kings and Princes, Bishops, Millionaires – but we finally decided that the most important person in our life at this moment is an African – an ordinary African. So* The African Drum *begins appropriately with a message from the sturly [sic] old African peasant*."

> symbol of black power and achievement […] The beauty queen in the bus queue, poised with her umbrella and vanity bag, dazzling and sharply in focus, with the blurred faces of ordinary Africans carrying paper bags in the background, looking round at this apparition of African glory […] The breakfast-table picture, almost compulsory in every number, of an African hero sitting down to a meal with his wife and children in a small location house, like anyone else […] The jazzman, blowing his trumpet or sax in a crazy pose, lying on the floor and kicking his legs in a frenzy, catching the hectic jazz in his movements […] The African businessman sitting at the wheel of his large American car, tremendously sedate and respectable, with a dark suit and a gold tiepin, a picture of success and stability […] Where photographs were a language, juxtaposition was all-important: we could never rely on captions to tell a story. The same faces, but different surroundings: the simple girl with the cloth round her hair opposite the radiant bride; the bus driver opposite the band leader; the nanny opposite the film star; the fashionable socialite opposite the gangster. The contrasts caught the sharp duality of African life, which touched everyone.

See, for instance, a profile piece on Zimbabwean-born singer Dorothy Masuka,[58] in which music editor Todd Matshikiza, in his characteristic gossip-laden musical writing style that is soon called 'Matshikese' by his colleagues,[59] leans on what Su Holmes (2005) calls the 'star-is-born' narrative. He writes about Dorothy's extraordinary precocity in terms of talent. Despite the limitations and challenges of her childhood: "*She began stage work at seven years old*", an age at which, "*Most kids are just beginning to see the light*", in a single-parent household, as her father left the family when Dorothy was only a year old. This last detail appears to emphasise her innate musical talent, as her domestic circumstances probably prized survival above the cultivation of talent. Yet she emerged as a talented singer, "*a pretty packet of dynamite*" on stage, delivering her "*famous tunes with unusual zest*".

There is also a sense of extraordinariness in terms of how Masuka is eroticised in the profile, with this kind of eroticisation characteristic of 1950s *Drum* coverage of women in entertainment, particularly jazz singers. Dorothy Driver (1996: 233) writes that *Drum*'s coverage of jazz singers allows, "desire to pass back and forth between star and author", and you can feel that happening between the singer and Matshikiza, even as he uses a

[58] Matshikiza, Todd, "*Everybody's Dotty!*", *Drum*, January 1955.
[59] See Jim Bailey (1982) and Michael Titlestad (2005). Sampson (2004: 14) writes of how Matshikiza "transformed *Drum*. He wrote as he spoke, in a brisk tempo with rhythm in every sentence. He attacked the typewriter like a piano. Our readers loved 'Matshikese', as we called it, which was the way they talked and thought, beating in time with the jazz within them".

woman fan to channel the appeal. The fan seems to be intrigued, one could perhaps even say inspired, by how Dorothy uses her eyes, seemingly to lure men who are fans. There is a blurring between the singer's private and public personae in this comment, ultimately contributing to her allure:

> *One woman said to me, "Did you see how [Masuka] uses her eyes? She makes them sleep. She makes them wake. Then she makes bedroom eyes. Then she make [sic] goo-goo eyes. Honestly, you'd think these star-girls want every man around. It's most exciting".*[60]

Dorothy's allure, "aura" (Marshall 1997) or "charisma" (Dyer 1991), evident in this comment is further underlined by comments on the singer's sex appeal. Matshikiza directly address the men who make up the majority of the magazine's readership at the time: "*shoo – gents!*" He then calls her a "*sizzling hepcat*" and "*burning hot stuff*". His copy can only be described as suggestive:

> *She was wearing a bebop hair cut. She wore a dress with a wide flare, and wide stripes. The wide stripes were running down her whole body, neck to hem. Round her curves. Under the belt round her cute waist. Into the men's eyes. Yes, man!*[61]

And also in this comment, which acknowledges, albeit superficially, the existence of both professional and private life, and again eroticises her:

> *Dorothy is one of the best-dressed women in showbiz – off and on stage*. *She takes great pains over the clothes she wears – and on how her lips look. Must be something to kiss them.*[62]

The fact that she is engaged to be married and thus unavailable is portrayed as adding to her appeal, as is her projected future life with a wealthy man:

> *Well, well, those eyes gents […] those eyes are as fully booked as the December train. Dorothy will be spliced by the time you read this, if all goes well. Ya, spliced to a mac in Bulawayo, with lots of dough. Two shops. Two butchers. Two cars and two eyes to know a fine girl when he sees one. The lucky bloke is Mr Simon Petto. She likes him a hang of a lot. She says we Joh'burg mugs just want to run away with a girl's head.*

[60] Matshikiza, Todd, "*Everybody's Dotty!*", *Drum*, January 1955.
[61] *Ibid*.
[62] *Ibid*.

> *This guy Petto is not running away with Dorothy's head. So, she's taking him "head to"*.[63]

The singer's seductive powers are further emphasised (and her fashion-consumption habits revealed) in an article entitled "*Lovely legs and lingerie!*"[64] The article directly addresses the women readers of *Drum*, and its author byline is Ethel Madlingozi, presumably a woman. Yet there seems to be an element of the male gaze to be traced here in the focus of the article that becomes even more pronounced if one considers that the article might very well have been written by one of the men on the *Drum* editorial staff under the Madlingozi pseudonym. After all, Driver (1996: 235) surmises that the 'women' writers in the early years of *Drum* were mostly "a worried syndicate of men".

As the header indicates, the article's focus is on Dorothy's selection of lingerie and sleepwear and is illustrated by a number of revealing photographs of the singer in her underwear and scant sleepwear, photographed in bed by Bob Gosani. The combination of intimate information contained in the body copy of the article and the flesh-baring photographs in a space that resembles a bedroom creates the distinct impression of being in the intimate, personal, *private* space of the singer, both in terms of her home and in terms of her body. This *is* Dorothy's private life and even, save for the scant underwear she is wearing, her private parts, the article seems to be claiming, in a particularly gossipy style of writing. And what a seductive 'private' life it is. "*Dainty underwear*" is "*sprawled recklessly around her*" on a bed, one of the captions reveals, and Madlingozi admits to gasping when she saw the star's collection of dresses, under-garments and nighties:

> *You should see them! I mean, you ladies […] She still loves pyjamas and nylon nighties either embroidered or trimmed with soft lace which makes one feel like eating them. So when Dotty goes to bed she goes really gay. There's something about natty foundation garments. They give the person they contain a dainty likeliness. When you're lucky enough to meet dat Dot dish next time and you spot twirling girlishness about her manner, now you know that she has slept well in seersucker night clothes, and that even now underneath she rustles silvery nylon […] 'Nother thing, Dotty has these expensive new bras called Merry Widow […] Mere males will wonder why clothing that is not seen should be so fancy and expensive. But then they don't have our tastes for the fine and delicate. They really ought to see*

[63] *Ibid*.
[64] Madlingozi, Ethel, "Lovely legs and lingerie!", *Drum*, April 1957.

> *Dorothy Masuka's underwear. Then again I think they shouldn't. Why cast pearls before swine?*[65]

This bedroom scene described by Madlingozi in *Drum* is an interesting one to consider in that it provides a rare and as-yet fairly unprecedented, at least in terms of the fanzine representation of stardom, entry into one of the most private rooms in the domestic space. However, this early exposure of the very private realm in *Drum* can still be described as mild and discreet, not least because the photographs were obviously taken in a studio space made up to look like a bedroom, and not in Dorothy's actual bedroom. Save perhaps for the hint at extravagance ("*Mere males will wonder why clothing that is not seen should be so fancy and expensive*"), which again provides a hint of the extraordinary, Madlingozi's description in *Drum* is relatively restrained.

But, as with the Matshikiza article cited above, there is again an undeniable measure of eroticisation in the Madlingozi piece, which is further amplified by the selection of ultimately revealing photographs. This characteristic eroticisation of women jazz musicians in *Drum* (which in a way makes the magazine a very early version of the British 'girlie' or 'lad' magazines typical of the late 20th century) is one of a handful of elements of the magazine's distinctive representation of fame in the middle of the century. *Drum* moves away from the classic early-20th-century magazine re-presentation of an already established image, and in certain respects follows in the footsteps of the Hollywood fanzines in that it is an important co-creator or co-producer, by way of its coverage, of a new understanding of fame. I have already explored *who* is selected for inclusion in coverage under this notion of fame and the discussion continues as to *why* they are covered. But *how Drum* covers the (private and public) lives of the entertainers also makes this famous figure distinct and contributes to the magazine playing a co-producing role in the making of fame.

Besides the already-mentioned eroticisation that Driver (1996) has identified, the way in which *Drum* constructs its *Star* figure also involves a reliance on photographs that are widely read as portraying the 'soul' of performers, as Ansell (2007) writes. She makes specific reference, in this instance, to the images shot by *Drum* staff photographer Jürgen Schadeberg, whose "sharp eye and lens framed the jaunty insouciance of the Jazzomolos; the sardonic dash of reedman Gwigwi Mrwebi, the style of bandleader Makwenkwe

[65] *Ibid*.

'Mackay' Davashe; the intensity of South Africa's 'Bird' – saxophonist Kippie Morolong Moeketsi" (Ansell 2007: 16).

Drum was originally conceptualised as a "photographic magazine", its founder, Jim Bailey (1982: 125), writes, and the publication purposely recruited staff members from comparable international titles. It can be seen as perhaps the most prominent successor to *Zonk!* (with its slogan "African People's Pictorial"), which launched in 1949, just two years before the launch of *Drum*. *Zonk!* was a pioneering publication on many fronts, as Irwin Manoim (1983) argues in his exploration of the early years of the black press in South Africa. *Zonk!* was, for instance, the first mass-produced photomagazine in South Africa, and the very "first successful mass-circulation black magazine aimed at urban audiences" (Manoim, 1983: 63). Importantly, it also focused primarily on entertainment and entertainers themselves and seemed to set a path not only for black magazines but for all magazines going forward: "Most magazines that have followed it have to a greater or lesser extent continued its basic formula", Manoim (1983: 63) argues. The fact that the influential *Zonk!* was a photomagazine, had a predominant focus on entertainment and also arguably set the scene for *Drum*'s particular brand of entertainment journalism perhaps goes some way towards explaining why the *Star* figure emerged so compellingly in the latter publication.

The moving images of film serve to inject a sense of the extraordinary into the figure of the screen star, and *Drum*'s now iconic photographs of musicians on stage and sportspeople on the field can be said to have done the same; these pictures undoubtedly brought a sense of glamour to how the figure of the *Star* emerged. Inglis writes (2010: 136) of how the original Hollywood film stars had "the untouchable closeness of luxurious enviability" and how they "appeared as intimately known yet inimitable, quite without physical blemish, smooth and swift and shining as a seal", and the *Drum* photographs of singers like Dorothy Masuka and also Miriam Makeba and Dolly Rathebe reflected similar qualities.

What also contributes to the way in which the figure of the *Star* emerges in *Drum* is the writing style and tone, which is conversational, gossipy and informal. The imagined *Drum* reader is often addressed directly in the copy (Matshikiza on numerous occasions in the piece on Masuka addresses the "*gents*" his article is aimed at and Madlingozi writes "*I mean, you ladies…*"). This breaking-the-fourth wall literary technique is one that will come to strongly characterise magazine coverage of famous figures towards the end of the 20th century and into the 21st.

Then there is also the idea of gossip in the *Drum* extracts already discussed here. *Drum*'s conversational style of writing has been noted before, and gossip forms a part of that, as it is originally associated with the spoken, not the written, form, write Karen Adkins (2002) and Nicholas Herriman (2010). Especially in the Madlingozi piece, you can certainly hear the voice of friends 'nattering' about another friend. Both the Matshikiza and Madlingozi articles have a sense of gossip because they essentially are 'idle' or 'small' talk about other people; these all form part of the various definitions of gossip, as written about by Rosnow and Fine (1976), as well as Goodman (1994) and Holland (1996). There is a very strong sense of complicity between writer and reader that both the direct address and the gossipy language bring about in the Masuka coverage discussed here, and Robin Dunbar (1996) and Rebecca Feasy (2008) both write that gossip is indeed a way of forging alliances. It is important to note that at this stage in the trajectory, there are strong indications that the alliance is built upon nothing but a shared sense of admiration for the famous figure. The woman fan Matshikiza quotes in his profile, for instance, does not hide the sense of excitement she experiences when she watches Dorothy's gestures on stage and considers how these are used in attracting the attention of men ("*It's most exciting*"), and there is undoubtedly a sense of appreciation (of curves, body and fashion) visible in Matshikiza's eroticisation.

Rumour, speculation and gossip are all techniques *Drum* used in its construction of the *Star* figure. In Masuka's case, *Drum* represents her as a *Star* by divulging information of both her professional and private life and emphasising the talented, 'star-is-born' narrative underpinning her career. By stressing her voluptuous figure, good sartorial sense and seductive charms, on the one hand, and her matrimonial unavailability on the other, the *Drum* coverage creates a kind of tension that contributes to her allure or charisma. *Drum*'s 1950s representation can, in large part, be likened to the type-driven portrayal of the 'beautiful woman' during the nascent years of the Hollywood film industry. As Inglis (2010: 187–188) explains, this woman may hold out "the promise of sexuality" (as do Dorothy's "*bedroom eyes*"), yet her "passion must be sincere and her abandon offscreen".

2.2 Dolly Rathebe: "*Just about Africa's most famous and exciting woman*"

Dorothy was certainly a *Drum* favourite during the 1950s, but fellow vocalist Dolly Rathebe was perhaps the quintessential female performer for the magazine at the time, and her exposure in *Drum* contributed to her construction as a *Star*. By the time the magazine

launched, she was already relatively well known, especially in the Reef area (in Johannesburg) where she grew up, as she had a recording contract and had also appeared in the 1949 film *Jim Comes to Jo'burg* (also known as *African Jim*). Interestingly, in the film she plays a singer, "*swathed in snake-like, seductive rolls of glittering dress*", as per Can Themba's description of her character in *Drum*,[66] so there appears to be coherence between her public and her private personae.

Thanks to *Drum*, she became famous amongst its urban black readership all over the country. As Ansell (2011: 35) argues, the magazine made her a "national figure", adding "detail (and often myth)" to the body of knowledge on her. Dolly's *Star* image, produced to a large extent by the magazine, relied on the fact that she was known for her activities in more than one medium: music *and* film. She featured on the cover numerous times and was the subject of a collection of iconic 'poster' or 'pin-up' images, including a 1957 photograph of her in a skimpy two-piece swimsuit, fashioned from handkerchiefs, on a Johannesburg mine dump, which was photographed to resemble a beach. Perhaps originating in the *Drum* newsroom, the rumour started circulating that as she and the white *Drum* staff photographer responsible for this 'beach' photo shoot, Jürgen Schadeberg, had left the mine dump, they were stopped and questioned by the authorities on suspicion of breaking the Immorality Act (which prohibited inter-racial relationships), but "*[I]t could not be proved that anything more than the camera's eye had peeked at Dolly's luscious figure*."[67]

This is but one of several speculative stories and rumours about 'Sis Dolly''s interactions, possibly sexual in nature, with the men of *Drum* men, that contributes to her image as both extraordinary yet also somewhat ordinary: glamorous, desirable and out of reach on the one hand, yet familiar, 'one of us' and attainable (at least for the so-called '*Drum* set') on the other. Dolly grew up in and for a large part of her life lived in the Johannesburg suburb of Sophiatown, alongside the *Drum* set. Similar to Hollywood in the early 20th century, 1950s Sophiatown's unique features distinguished it from other parts of Johannesburg and indeed other South African suburbs and cities. For a brief while under the nascent apartheid government, black people were entitled to own property here, which contributed to it being a place that allowed "unprecedented possibilities for blacks to choose and invent their society […] open to a variety of interpretations, dreams, commitments", as Paul Gready (1990: 139) writes. In her analysis of the "lost literary journalism of 1950s South Africa", as evident in *Drum*, Lesley Cowling (2016: 13) writes that "Sophiatown was a place where races

[66] Themba, Can, "*Dolly in films!*", *Drum*, February 1957.
[67] *Ibid*.

could mingle, parties were held, and its shebeens, music, celebrities, and gangsters were the source of many of the *Drum* writers' stories".

Nixon (1994: 31) describes how the "synthetic lure of Hollywood's […] glitter pervaded Sophiatown culture". And indeed, stories about 1950s Sophiatown and early 1900s Hollywood evoke the same sense of remoteness and exoticism, and the possibility of wild abandon. Sophiatown could so easily replace Hollywood in this description of the early days of Tinseltown by Richard Schickel (1985). Not unlike the people of Sophiatown in the mid-20th century, Hollywood's residents were able:

> to shake free of their inhibitions and repressions, to act out their fantasies. Here they were free to recreate themselves as they pleased. Or to lend themselves to recreation by directors, producers, writers, anyone who cared to have a go at them. And in this, the folks they left behind indulged them. (Schickel 1985: 12)

Lara Allen (2004: 19) argues that Dolly Rathebe offers "a revealing case study for an enquiry into the Sophiatown imaginary". It could certainly be argued that the singer's roots in the unusual, bohemian, exotic suburb of Sophiatown, with the connection between starlet and place often emphasised, either overtly or more subtly, in *Drum*, also contributed to her image as a *Star*.

She endorsed a number of products, most of them beauty and fashion related, in advertisements that appeared in the magazine. In 1957, *Drum* profiled her extensively in a series that ran over five months (January to May 1957). The instalments had generous word-counts, upward of 1 500 words each, and are illustrated with photographs of her on stage or in posed fashion shots.

In terms of its generous page- and word-count as well as its extensive biography style of writing, this series reminds one of the long-form hagiographic accounts afforded to the *Epic Hero* figure in magazines in the early 20th century. But the *Drum* series on Dolly Rathebe had more illustrative elements than the typical coverage one would find in the magazines of the early 20th century, in which the *Epic Hero* dominates. A substantial part of the *Drum* story was told in photographs. Going forward in the century, magazine coverage typically became less wordy, fewer pages were allocated to the coverage of each individual, and their narratives were mainly communicated by way of illustration. Pictures, more than words, told their stories. So the shifts in understandings of fame were visible in the actual people covered, what they were covered for, as well as *how* they were covered in terms of layout and use of words and pictures. Just in terms of its aesthetic format, this *Drum* series,

representing a middle point, is an excellent example of how the actual representation of the famous figure changed over the century.

The series showcases both Dolly's private and her public personae. The first instalment,[68] which specifically focuses on her love life, reveals that she adopted a stage name (her real name was Josephine Malatsi), not unlike iconic early (and even current) Hollywood stars such as Cary Grant (given name: Archibald Alec Leach). Authored by Themba, who is identified in the article as "*one of the men in Dolly's romantic life*", the article describes the singer as "*just about Africa's most famous and exciting woman torch* [romantic love-song] *singer*".[69] In this instalment, Themba builds the image of a tough and demanding woman in her private persona, especially of her men. He quotes her as saying:

> *"Men […] seem to have lost that manly tang, that rough, tough, solid masculinity that makes men so adorable. Nowadays, men have become catty, peevish, gossipy and mean; women have taken to wearing slacks"*.

Over the years she became the object of affection of many men, the article argues, with "*love-lorn lads […] gasping for Dolly in secret anguish*". As a child she was a tomboy, and an anecdote from her schooldays gives some detail about her childhood while simultaneously contributing to her appeal:

> *[A]t school Dolly was a tomboy. (But she was fond of boys!) She looked at life from a male point of view and seemed to have a quarrel with her Maker for creating her female. At one time the reverend father at St. Cyprian's, Sophiatown, where Dolly was schooled, wanted someone to go up the tower and release the hammer of the bell that had got caught. Without hesitation Dolly clambered up the tower and loosened the hammer. The boys still talk of the "bird's-eye view" they got on that occasion*.[70]

According to the Themba profile, there is great coherence between Dolly's public and private personae, both filled with juxtapositions. Just as her men range from "*quiet, dignified, halting of speech, shy, studious, well-behaved Jeff*" to abusive, "*tough, hard-hitting filibuster*" Hasie, so she would perform both choral music and township jazz, or mbaqanga. She is a Girl Guide and a Sunday-school teacher on the one hand, while on the other:

> *She knew she had a husky, furry voice that kindled in men's hearts strange desires and flashed before their tired, after-work imaginations dreams of torrid love and*

[68] Themba, Can, "*Dolly and her men!*", *Drum*, January 1957.
[69] *Ibid.*
[70] *Ibid.*

wanton abandon. And she knew more. She knew that a wiggle of her hips promotes a suggestive phrase of song with infinite seductiveness.[71]

A daughter of Sophiatown, she is simultaneously an ordinary township girl yet an extraordinary young woman who dares to dream and defy the oppressive government policies of the time:

[F]rom the beginning she was different from the domestic-servant, factory-working type of girl. She saw herself as an artist and she just wouldn't go to work. Not for a White man, that is.[72]

As in the case of Dorothy Masuka, the 'star-is-born' narrative is underlying in Dolly's *Star* image, as portrayed by *Drum*. In the second instalment of the profile series,[73] Themba uses colourful language and analogies to describe her innate talent, for music as well as acting, painting her as more than just an ordinary performer:

She used the stage as if every square inch belonged to her; as if she were a boxer in a ring and her art depended on her ability to prove that she had a life lease on it […] Dolly's movements were directed by mood and feeling and climate, and you never knew what that dame would do next but you knew it would be right.

Her acting talent is equally intuitive, according to Themba, and through her performances she becomes a medium reflecting the vicissitudes of township life:

[Her acting] was an unconscious desire to interpret the crawling fullness and ever-changing variety of township life […] She was so alive and reflexive to every tang in township life.[74]

Themba takes his portrayal of Dolly as medium even further, arguing that she is offered her first film role (in *Jim comes to Jo'burg*) because "*she was all Africa*".[75] Yet for the readers of *Drum* magazine, Rathebe could be likened to Hollywood's most luminous stars, as is evident from Themba's comment that:

[*Jim comes to Jo'burg*] *sounded like the real films. It sounded as if Africa was being transported into the fascinating world of Hollywood. And to us Hollywood did not mean divorces and a wild life. It meant glamour and wealth and idolatry. A few of us in the know about this film business, were asking, How many thousands of pounds*

[71] *Ibid*.
[72] *Ibid*.
[73] Themba, Can, "*Dolly in films!*", *Drum*, February 1957.
[74] *Ibid*.
[75] *Ibid*.

> *Dolly was earning now? How many gowns and palaces does she own? How many fan letters does she get? But for the rest of us she was a spangled, glitter-bespattered star, up above the heavens so high*.[76]

Again we are reminded of early Hollywood, and particularly Florence Lawrence, reportedly the first film actor to do a publicity appearance to meet the film-going public, back in 1910, when we read how Dolly, "*needed the publicity of appearing in the flesh before her thousands of admirers to prove that she was not just a dolled up puppet; the country was thirsting to meet its great heroine*".[77] Both women had to appear before their admirers to validate their authenticity, the former to prove that she was indeed not dead and the latter that she was not merely a film figment.

What makes *Drum*'s portrayal compelling is how she was constructed as a *Star*, in the original Hollywood understanding of the term. She was associated with the glamour and wealth of Hollywood, and the concomitant consumption habits. Her private life was guessed at and speculated about as something worthy of royalty, and she was placed on a pedestal and idolised by the many fans she was assumed to have. Throughout this thick description, she emerged as an extraordinary performer: she is the one woman able to channel Africa in Hollywood; an idol fawned over by fans, a glamorous star.

But the February 1957 instalment also mentions her ordinariness post her film exposure, and we are able to see the full ordinary-extraordinary juxtaposition, which lies at the heart of stardom, at work here. Themba asks, "*What did this sudden up-thrust into glory do to Dolly? Did it fill her head with boiled water, and make her strut like a peacock?*" Of course the answer is no: "*Nix! Dolly came right back to us and remained the impetuous Sophiatown kid she'd always been*".[78]

One is reminded here of Morin's assertion that, "Once the film is over, the actor becomes an actor again, the character remains a character, *but from their union is born a composite creature who participates in both, envelopes them both: a star*" (Morin, 1960: 39, original emphasis retained) on reading how there was a "*new poise and grace*" about Rathebe upon her return from the set of *Jim*. As Themba writes:

> *[Rathebe] came back to show business and its lesser world from the heights of stardom. But she came back a star. That made a difference. Her stage appearances*

[76] *Ibid*.
[77] *Ibid*.
[78] *Ibid*.

were henceforth heralded events. They drew the glamour-stunned as well as the merely curious.[79]

It is but one small part of the extensive coverage *Drum* afforded Dolly, but this paragraph reveals a great deal about the figure of the *Star* in the magazine in the 1950s, even evoking a sense of the preceding form of fame, that it is an ideal way to conclude this discussion.

It is admittedly suggestive and subliminal and perhaps only evident to the reader who considers the trajectory of 20th-century well-knownness as a whole, but there is a sense of Campbell's monomyth (Campbell 1949) and by extension the *Epic Hero* that surfaces here. Like the hero who "ventures forth from the world of common day" (Campbell, in Drucker 1994: 84–85), Dolly embarked from a "*lesser*" world and scaled the "*heights of stardom*". There is the idea of a journey, which in the monomyth included "supernatural wonder […] fabulous forces and a decisive victory" (Campbell, in Drucker, 1994: 84–85). Dolly's journey might not have had any supernatural elements or forces, but the way in which she is represented in *Drum* certainly conjures up a sense of wonder and fabulousness.

Moreover, like the protagonist in Campbell's monomyth, she returns, and she is *changed*, because she is now a *Star*. The *Epic Hero* returns "with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man" (Campbell, in Drucker 1994: 84–85). Dolly's personal journey also brings her power, first to draw audiences ("*her appearances are henceforth heralded*", Themba writes), and secondly, to share some of the glamour she acquired while she was away, to shower her audience with a bit of her stardust.

It is important to note that at this, the midpoint of the 20th century, there is still an element of the *Epic Hero* that continues to surface in magazine representations of fame, albeit fairly subtly and suggestively. But it is equally important to point out that these are mere *hints* and references to a previous understanding of well-knownness constructed by early 20th-century magazines. There might be a suggestion of the epic in this paragraph on Dolly's journey to stardom, but here she is represented first and foremost as a *Star*. Her credentials as an entertainer are alluded to, but Themba also makes it clear that she has distinguished herself from the "*lesser world*" of showbusiness to establish herself "*up there".* Note the idea of elevation, which refers to the definition of stars as heavenly bodies, emerging here, at the "*heights of stardom*". Themba is hinting, in this paragraph, at how *Drum* in general represents the *Star* figure, and it corresponds in broad terms to many of the attempts at a

[79] *Ibid*.

definition of stardom I have come across in the academic literature. These seem to suggest that stardom presupposes an element of entertainment, but being an entertainer does not necessarily make you a *Star*. Dolly is a showbusiness personality, Themba appears to suggest, but she is also something much more elevated and desirable: a *Star*.

Her stardom changed things, Themba seems to suggest when he writes, "*she came back a star. That made a difference*". His explanation that, "*Her stage appearances henceforth became heralded events*" reminds one of early Hollywood film history and how the whole marking system evolved from an almost chance discovery by film production studios that 'name billing', i.e. announcing the names of the actors on promotional materials such as posters, could be a highly successful tool to market films and thus attract audiences. Like the actors of early Hollywood, Dolly's name alone will lure the crowds, will bring the spectators, Themba seems to suggest here.

One is also reminded of the evolution of the Hollywood marketing machine and the understanding of the *Star* itself in Themba's hint, in how he represents Dolly, at a play between the public and the private as well as the notions of the ordinary and extraordinary. Having seen her play a self-reflexive character on the big screen in *Jim*, they come bearing knowledge of her larger-than-life extraordinariness and the heights that she scaled to stardom in the hopes of glimpsing something of her private life, and perhaps ordinary side, during a live performance.

Conclusion

Themba writes that Dolly's live performances drew, amongst other interested spectators, "*the glamour-stunned*". The element of lustre that Themba refers to throughout the series on Dolly published in *Drum* is of course another characteristic that emerges strongly in academic discussions of stardom. It can be argued that an element of glamour seemed to be a prerequisite of the *Star* figure first constructed by the Hollywood film industry. The notion of glamour also emerged as an important characteristic in the kind of entertainment figure early issues of the South African magazine *Drum* constructed, which has led to the labelling the entertainer in this category as the *Star*.

Glamour is specifically alluded to as this analysis of the *Star* figure concludes and the next looms, since it has emerged as a key marker in the trajectory of 20th-century fame. It is a quality that seems to have a particularly close association with actors who were at the height of their careers in the early days of the Hollywood film industry in the first half of the

20th century. American screen actors born around the fin de siècle are most often linked to the term, which is, tellingly, also very often used in relation to the phrase 'old Hollywood'.

'Old Hollywood' may have commercialised the idea of glamour, but the Hollywood film industry's marketing model soon came to be applied to other genres of entertainment also, with musicians and even sportspeople being represented in these terms, in South Africa and internationally. Of the musicians, jazz and blues players from the early 20th century emerged as particularly suitable to a glamorous kind of representation reminiscent of Hollywood's portrayal of its screen actors.

It has been suggested that the link between film entertainers and glamour, and its subsequent inclusion in the Hollywood marketing model, is largely due to the kind of aesthetic characteristic of films produced during the early decades of the 20th century, the product of a specific approach to cinematography. "Glamour is the result of chiaroscuro, the play of light on the landscape of the face, the use of the surroundings through the composition, through the shaft of the hair and creating mysterious shadows in the eyes", writes filmmaker Josef von Sternberg. Moving images, specifically those from early 20th-century films (which were mostly black and white), had the ability to glamorise, and so, arguably, did still photographs used by the magazines.

Still photographs are certainly used to great glamorising effect in 1950s *Drum*. Like the films of the glamorous 'old Hollywood' era, 1950s *Drum* photographs are also mostly black and white. One could perhaps argue that the black and white printing process, probably preferred as the most commercially viable at the time, is partly what allowed for a strong element of glamour and, subsequently, the *Star* figure to emerge in 1950s *Drum*.

Put differently, it could be said that, in a way, the dominant commercial print technology influenced the kind of figure that emerged from the magazine coverage. During a time in which magazines and their photographs were mostly black and white, it seems this figure had a strong element of glamour.

However, as the century progressed, the printing process evolved and black-and-white photography was gradually replaced by full-colour representation in magazines. Little by little the glamour also seemed to wane. The fading of glamour is significant because it could be read as symbolic of bigger underlying shifts in the kind of figure that emerged as dominant in magazine coverage towards the end of the 20th century.

The magazines steadily shifted their gaze from glamour, success, wealth and other appealing elements that were typical of *Star* coverage to the exposure of less appealing and more gritty, some would even argue something more real, more authentic, elements.

All the elements associated with glamour, including beauty, fashion and allure, charisma or charm, have a sense of the 'external' about them, revealing more about the appearance than the feelings or emotions of the entertainer. Consequently, as glamour faded somewhat from magazine coverage, so, gradually, did an exclusive focus on outward appearance. In its place, it could be argued, there was a growing exposure of not only the private life but also the inner or emotional life of the famous personality.

Given these shifts, the dominant figure that could be traced in magazine coverage of the second half of the century inched away slightly from the *Star* figure that was explored here and came to represent a radical departure from the *Epic Hero* that dominated magazines during the first few decades of the century. Although these shifts happened gradually over time, they were prominent enough to merit another category of fame, which is marked with an existing and widely used term, Celebrity.

These are global shifts in magazine publishing, and we saw them happening locally in *Drum* magazine. As the 1980s approached, other qualities started appearing in the magazine's coverage of entertainers, and a slightly altered version of the *Star* materialised in less sanitised, more edgy and flaw-focused content that foreshadowed the unapologetically scandal-dominated successive form of fame that became pervasive in very early 21st-century coverage. This figure, the *Emerging Celebrity*, could certainly be identified in *Drum*, as well as in other local magazines with substantial entertainment content, including weeklies such as *Huisgenoot* and *Personality*. Yet it was in the South African bi-monthly *People* magazine that this understanding was arguably most visible and best explored in the South African context. From Stars to *People*, this shift, with its hint of descent, follows in the next chapter.

Chapter 3:
Emerging Celebrity: *Star*, Celebrity and the space between: *People* SA in the late 1980s

The idea of a descent is a fitting one to describe the transition from the previous form of fame to the next. The kind of figure that dominated weekly magazine coverage in the mid-20th century was a sparkly, glittering and glamorous entertainer who enchanted on screen or stage and beyond, and even into the private realm: the *Star*, with all its associations of bright light and elevation.

But from those heights, the dominant figure of the *Star* slowly starts descending, in this next incarnation of fame, and this descent is unpacked here in the local edition of *People* magazine. From the heavens to the earth, from *Stars* to *People*, descent distinguishes this famous figure.

In naming the next category of fame, consideration was given to the apparently growing preference, towards the end of the 20th century, for the term 'celebrity magazines' to describe the gossip titles that have been identified as successors of the film-fan magazines of the early half of the century, by Sternheimer (2011) among others. Consideration was also given to what appeared to be the naturalised use in the media of the term 'celebrity', which was often used interchangeably with 'star'. To distinguish the new figure from its predecessor in the 20th-century trajectory, I use the well-known term Celebrity.

The descent that is encompassed by the Celebrity figure, in a way, defies a precise definition, as it appears to involve a whole spectrum of both behaviour and thought. Broadly, though, it concerns a focus on the idea of imperfection, whether in terms of physical flaw, emotional shortcomings, errors of judgment or general misbehaviour.

The magazine coverage specifically explores this notion of imperfection in the *private* life of the well-known figure. This new, dedicated focus represents a further dismantling of the boundary between the public and the private. This is a general entertainment-news magazine trend of the later 20th century, both locally and internationally, and part of a continuous effort on the part of the entertainment media to meet the perceived audience demand for a glimpse of the real or authentic entertainment personality, as Gamson (2001) and specifically also Karen Sternheimer (2011) contend. "Being authentic […] or 'real' is a dominant rhetorical device of fame", Sean Redmond (2006: 28) argues. But it is a further dismantling, since it is a continuation of a process already initiated by the so-called film-fan

magazines, or fanzines, that were first produced by the Hollywood film industry to market their screen actors in the early half of the 20th century and that arguably shaped the form coverage of entertainment personalities assumed in a host of other magazines and media around the world throughout the century.

The Celebrity, the figure that first emerges in late 20th-century magazine coverage, is built on the Hollywood film-studio *Star* blueprint yet simultaneously breaks away from it in that it begins to hint at an element of imperfection, of deviation from the norm, and in the 'wrong' direction, which is something that was carefully eschewed before, in an attempt to maintain the appearance of the model private life. Both the *Star* and its predecessor in the trajectory being traced here, the *Epic Hero*, are founded on notions of the model and the 'perfect'. Even an inkling of imperfection or flaw would, of course detract from what the *Epic Hero* figure represented, namely inspiration for others, through his behaviour in the public arena of war, politics, intellectual and religious life, to live better lives and work towards the common good. Hence the absence, in magazine representation that surfaced the *Epic Hero* in the early 20th century, of any reference to behaviour or actions that could be construed as faulty or wrong.

The sense of exemplariness that surfaced the *Epic Hero* continued, in a sense, in the fanzines and the way the *Star* was generally represented. Despite the distinct differences between these two figures, they share a sense of 'model-ness'. The *Epic Hero* was a model citizen and displayed exemplary behaviour, whereas the *Star* was represented in terms of 'perfect' physical features and proportions; their model bodies, in other words. In addition, they were also cast in their films as prototypes, prime examples of social types. It is also quite telling to see how Dyer's (1979: 53–68) categorisation of these social types seems to be devoid of all transgression; typical characters Dyer includes are the "tough guy", the "pin-up girl" and, significantly, even the "good Joe". In addition, early Hollywood plotlines did not give their typecast characters much room to misbehave, because their on-screen characters were "by and large kept away from the wrongdoing in the action (except for those deliberately invented […] as gangsters", as Inglis (2010: 187) reminds us.

Consequently, the exposed film-studio-choreographed 'private' lives of the actors of early 20th-century Hollywood cinema also seemed to be largely devoid of imperfection, as great care was taken to ensure coherence between the private and public image, as DeCordova (1991), amongst others, argues. Like those of their on-screen characters, these film actors'

private, off-screen personas were also largely fictional, despite being marketed as a glimpse of the real person.

It is significant, particularly in this consideration of the deliberate exposure of imperfection and misbehaviour, that the main form that seems to inspire the fictitious private life of the early Hollywood actor is none other than the fairy tale, with its associations both of unusual happiness and of one-dimensional protagonists who, importantly, do not deviate from societal norms and expectations.

But then the fairy tale ends, and the image of the Hollywood actor of earlier years gradually makes way for a different kind of figure, one that emerged, in essence, in magazine coverage that deliberately revealed supposed imperfections, misjudgements, shortcomings, and fallibilities, again in the ongoing attempt to depict the real or authentic self. It is of the essence to note here that the focus of the coverage might have been on these 'negative' elements, yet the selection of personalities was still based on essentially the same 'positive' qualities as with the figure called the *Star* in this categorisation, including but not limited to success, glamour and allure.

The coverage specifically identified these failures and shortcomings as taking place in the private lives of the entertainment personalities. If in the latter half of the 20th century, the majority of the personalities covered in the magazines were still actors known for their public performances in films, the Hollywood fanzine formula was gradually applied to other entertainers as well, notably, at this point, a small selection of those who were mainly known for the parts they played on television.

Generally, although film actors would always outnumber television personalities in magazines, the growing coverage of the latter in the Hollywood fanzine formula previously reserved for the former might have contributed to the changes in representation we see towards the end of the century. Specifically, the television personality's presence in magazine coverage somewhat diminished the sense of glamour (and thereby the extraordinary) suggested by film and stage performers and to some extent even sportspeople. Since the glamorous extraordinariness typically associated with screen and stage performers was largely absent in television personalities, it could be argued that they were in essence the opposite, namely ordinary. The idea of descent permeates the trajectory of fame being traced, and it is hard not to be compelled by how it seems to extend to the physical height of the screens through which we engage with these

performers in their public performance; we literally look up to them in cinemas or on stages, yet the medium that is television brings them down to eye level.

It is this idea of being level with the viewer that Ellis (1982) seems to be referring to when he argues that television presents no play between the ordinariness and the extraordinariness of its performers, which means the private lives of television actors cannot be presented as "anything particularly glamorous" (Ellis, 1982: 105). Thus, when television performers entered the general group of personalities who warranted representation in magazines, there was arguably a 'de-glamorising' effect. "[W]hile film stars were arguably glamorous and distant, television's celebrities were seen to be more intimate and ordinary", Rixon (2011: 44) writes. This 'deglamorisation' and heightened sense of the ordinary seemingly brought about by the inclusion of the television personality in magazine coverage generally seems to complement the increasing focus on imperfection and misbehaviour in the private lives of these personalities.

In addition, critically, there seems to be a growing focus on the private inner, emotional or psychological life of the entertainment personality and their supposed doubts, misgivings and errant thoughts. In other words, there is a sense, in the coverage of the late 20th-century famous figure, of failure and imperfection not only in their private behaviour, but also in terms of their private thoughts.

At first, the idea of the imperfect is conveyed mainly through textual devices, including gossip and rumour. These devices were, of course, also used in the representation of the *Star* and have even become synonymous with media coverage of entertainment personalities, especially the weekly magazines, which are often colloquially referred to as 'gossip magazines'. Yet gossip and rumour, which could be said to have been more benign in the time of the *Star*, took a definite turn towards the scurrilous and scandalous in coverage surfacing the imperfect.

Compared to typical coverage of the *Star*, magazine representation of the Celebrity employs an additional textual device to gossip and rumour: confession. It is a key characteristic that helps to distinguish between the categories of *Star* and Celebrity. It is also an interesting one to consider, as it seems to reflect the shift towards the inclusion of elements of the inner, emotional or psychological life of the famous figure. Whereas gossip and rumour have a strong quality of 'third person' about them, the Celebrity confession is exclusively 'first person'. The notion of confession is associated with inner or psychological life and, importantly, also a conflicted or troubled emotional life, and the idea of misbehaviour. In

fact, as both King (2008) and Redmond (2008) remind us in a special edition of the journal *Social Semiotics* devoted to confession in the fame industry, confession has a strong connection to religion and sin, that most extreme form of misbehaviour.

What can be seen in late 20th-century South African weekly magazine coverage, however, are the first tentative indications of the confession trend, which would come to encompass all media engaging with showbusiness, including television and eventually the new media. These early confessions include one-on-one interviews and other first-person accounts, which could rather be described as select disclosure and revelations of inner feelings more than misbehaviour.

Importantly, at this stage, all the devices employed by the magazines as evidence of imperfection, including rumour, gossip and the early forms of confession, are textual. This despite the fact that, compared to typical coverage of earlier in the century, we see the page space and word count devoted to each individual personality shrinking. Tabloid devices (such as a tear to illustrate the end of a relationship) might be used for visual illustration, but for the most part, the evidence is in the copy, not in the accompanying photographs. This is a crucial shift, as going forward in the trajectory, magazines will use textual and visual devices in equal measure in the coverage, which implies that word counts and textual coverage continues to dwindle as the century progresses, in order to allow space for visual representation. There is a growing sense, as we move into the 21st century, of the magazines not only covering or reporting on but actually *exposing* imperfection, using both textual and visual devices to present their evidence, specifically paparazzi photography. This is one of the reasons for the identification of two successive figures under the heading 'Celebrity' around the turn of the 20th century.

The notion of imperfection, which now starts becoming a distinguishing characteristic, brings about more shifts in the interplay between the ordinary and extraordinary that informed the way fame has been represented in magazines over the 20th century. Put differently, depending on the moment in the trajectory, pieces of evidence are alternately used to emphasise ordinariness or extraordinariness. With the *Epic Hero* figure of the early decades, the "extraordinary talents" (Howells 2011: 114) displayed in public dominated coverage, almost entirely eclipsing the ordinary in the way fame is represented. The literature on stardom, and the pioneering work done by Dyer (1979), officially gave the exchange of the two elements a name, the 'ordinary–extraordinary paradox', and identified it as an essential tenet underlying that understanding of fame. Where the *Star* is concerned,

this paradox has been read alternately as indicative of the play between the quotidian and the distinctive, as Holmes (2005) points out, or to show up the contradictions between the *Star*'s private and public life, an observation made by Ellis (1992), and Philip Drake and Andy Miah (2010), amongst others. The paradox has also been applied, as Rixon (2011) notes, to the play between the intimacy and distance that the *Star* is seen to embody.

The introduction of an element of imperfection into the definition of well-knownness again changed the way this juxtaposition could be interpreted. In the late 20th-century figure, textual evidence of imperfection, shortcoming and supposed flaw seems to be emphasised most often in order to mark ordinariness in a kind of 'they make mistakes, just like us' narrative. By extension, the 'they are people, just like us' statement is an easy one to make, which of course makes a magazine titled *People* a seemingly apt choice for this investigation. 'Ordinary because flawed', which seems to be a dominant theme in the form of well-knownness unpacked here, can again be contrasted with what is to come, when a connection between extraordinariness and, particularly, misbehaviour becomes noticeable. This is another distinction that motivated for two separate figures around the turn of the 20th century.

Following two previous successive forms of fame that seem to avoid any mention of imperfection and/or misbehaviour, the *Epic Hero* and the *Star*, comes this new dominant figure, which appears to deliberately surface of a sense of flaw. The term 'dominant' is important here, as this project is specifically focused on the main or dominant figures emerging in popular weekly magazine coverage. Although the notion of flaw admittedly started surfacing in popular magazines before the late 20th century, most notably in early copies of *Confidential*, founded in the 1950s, as Victor Davis (2002) and Holmes (2005) correctly point out, it is only later that misbehaviour and imperfection become dominant themes in coverage of entertainment personalities. It gains dominance arguably because it also becomes *sanctioned* by the stars themselves only later in the century; this is evident in the fact that the entertainment-personality misbehaviour only headlined in *Confidential* for five years before the so-called court 'Trial of the 100 Stars' forced the magazine to change editorial course and focus on positive rather than exposé-driven showbusiness stories.

To look ahead, a pointing out of flaw continued to be a prominent element of magazine coverage going into the 21st century. It arguably becomes more pronounced in various ways, and it also often more deplored. It is this often-bewailed identification of imperfection and flaw that is so unmistakable in the first 21st-century incarnation of well-knownness that

originally inspired this research project. While it was initially projected that there would only be three categories of fame in the trajectory, with the corresponding figures being the *Epic Hero*, the *Star* and the Celebrity, a fourth one seemed to emerge from the archival evidence consulted.

There is an intermediate or transitional form of fame located between the *Star* and the Celebrity of the first decade of the 21st century. It is intermediate precisely because it was on the one hand built upon the Hollywood blueprint yet, on the other, undoubtedly prepared for the form of fame with its preference for flaw that eventually dominated early 21st-century magazine coverage.

Before this more radical kind of fame, which will be unpacked in detail in the following chapter, came its more rudimentary and perhaps seemingly less coherent predecessor, and I found the best local example of this form of fame in the South African *People* magazine. As the argument is that there is a foreshadowing of the 21st-century trend in the late 20th century, the final category of fame has been split in two. Thus the two figures that emerged in coverage around the end of the 20th century were named *Emerging Celebrity* and *Celebrity Proper*.

As it is based on the concept of the *Star*, yet is an early incarnation of a more extreme and radical understanding of fame that comes to characterise the early years of the 21st century, the *Emerging Celebrity* is best explored in relation to its predecessor and successor. Using some examples from early issues of *People* SA, the next part of this chapter will briefly compare the three consecutive categories and emphasise how this precursor to the more radical *Celebrity Proper* distinguishes itself from the latter, as well as from the *Star*.

The possible late 20th-century media and socio-cultural elements that might have influenced the appearance of this particular figure at this point will also be highlighted. Yet the link between the representation of fame in magazine coverage and the reigning social and cultural factors, especially on the local landscape, becomes more complex to define, at least compared to discussions of the *Star* and the *Epic Hero* in the preceding two chapters. Pioneers from the Great Trek and military heroes from the South African wars of the turn of the 19th century held obvious cachet for the fledgling Afrikaner nation targeted as the main readership of the new early 20th-century magazine *Huisgenoot.* As Sparks (1990: 277) explains, for the Afrikaners, “Just as the heroic past became sanctified, so did the heroes become deified”. Similarly, the *Star* held particular appeal for the urbanising black readers of *Drum* magazine in the middle of the century. Nixon (1994: 31) explains how, “Hollywood

offered a mixture of transport and recognition; a reprieve from apartheid's suffocating prohibitions". In addition, Hollywood offered a rough blueprint for the publicisation of private lives of entertainers that could apparently be successfully applied to local black musicians, actors and sports stars in *Drum*.

However, the factors that may have influenced the emergence of the *Emerging Celebrity* towards the turn of the century in the local edition of *People*, with its apparently largely white readership, are challenging to identify. There was growing exposure to global media and specifically magazine influences in terms of products and means of production, specifically to those from the United States. Nixon (1994: 160) notes an "accelerated Americanization of South African culture […] since the mid-1970s" and attributes it mainly to South Africa being isolated from cultural material from Britain thanks to a boycott contributing towards the global campaign to end apartheid. Subsequently, a local version of the US magazine brand *People* was launched in the 1980s. At this point, the American influence that had undoubtedly played a part in the emergence of the *Star* in *Drum* in the 1950s and also the *Epic Hero* in early *Huisgenoot* became exclusive and concentrated.

Compared to its US namesake, *People* SA seemed to veer more towards sensational tabloid-like content focused on entertainment personalities behaving 'badly'. But compared to its more radical 21st-century incarnation, the misbehaviour of the *Emerging Celebrity* of 1980s *People* is still fairly tame and modest. The preparatory nature of the *Emerging Celebrity* can partially be attributed to the position of magazines vis-à-vis the local censorship laws at this point. Jan-Ad Stemmet (2005: 206) argues that in the "dramatic mid-1980s", the local apartheid government's "censorship of non-political material gradually became somewhat more relaxed, albeit in a very subtle way". So from around the time *People* launched in SA, there appeared to be more freedom to publish material that might have been deemed too controversial and even banned a few years before; Stemmet (2005), for instance, recalls the banning of issues of local women's magazines *Sarie*, *Fair Lady* and *Cosmopolitan* in the early 1980s due to content that was deemed too sexually explicit. *People* was certainly relatively accustomed to controversial, even 'risqué' and subversive material, as it belonged to the same parent company (Republican Press, later Perskor) as local weekly men's interest magazine *Scope*, and there was even some overlap in terms of staff members. Yet there was presumably an expectation for *People* to keep its material, and coverage of entertainment-personality misbehaviour, within certain acceptable limits, since it was a family magazine; moreover as Froneman (2011: 50) reminds us, it was published by Perskor, "a company that

had National Party cabinet ministers as directors and sided with the more conservative elements in government".

Against the conservative socio-political climate of 1980s South Africa, it is perhaps not surprising that coverage revealing the misbehaviour and flaws of white people, such as that appearing in *People* SA, would intentionally avoid 'incrimination' of local personalities and thus focus on international entertainers instead. The first half of the century saw plenty of local personalities emerging in magazine coverage, first as *Epic Hero* and then as *Star* figures. By contrast, during the second half of the century, the focus shifted from local to global, and magazine coverage was more often of international than South African personalities.

Since its establishment, the focus in *People* was decidedly non-political in nature; the individual people it covered were almost all entertainers, and no space was afforded to contemporary politicians. This is particularly interesting to consider in the light of the fact that great changes were afoot in South Africa in the late 1980s, as the country faced its important transition to democracy. The notion of the 'political celebrity' was already established. By the time he was inaugurated, Nelson Mandela, the first democratically elected president of South Africa, was already internationally acclaimed. He was a global icon and the face of South Africa's groundbreaking transition to democracy and was often seen in the company of a coterie of entertainers including Naomi Campbell, Bono and others. Mandela and F.W. de Klerk, the man who preceded him as state president, jointly won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1993.

In other words, there was undoubtedly the possibility for *People* SA to participate in what Driessens (2012: 643) calls "celebrification", a term he reserves for "the process by which […] public figures are transformed into celebrities", of some of the prominent politicians of 1990s South Africa. Yet the local weekly did not have any coverage of politicians whatsoever during this time, not even at key moments such as when Mandela was released in November 1990, after spending 27 years in prison. The same applies during the first democratic elections in April 1994 and the month that followed, when Mandela was inaugurated.

Given the almost 'golden' opportunity it had to celebrate a prominent force in the transition like De Klerk or a global icon like Mandela, *People*'s omission of political content and dearth of coverage of politicians in *People* SA during the dawn of the New South Africa is extraordinary. However, this lack of interest in politicians continues to characterise weekly entertainment magazines in South Africa and globally. The absence of coverage of politicians

in the late 1980s and early 1990s in *People* SA could partly be attributed to the fact that these personalities did not quite fit with the magazine's editorial focus at the time, and the politicians of the New South Africa would have been more suited to *Hero* than Celebrity coverage. Also, it might have been the eve of the dawn of democracy, yet South African society still remained divided along racial lines, with the majority of the white population quite conservative. This suggests *People* SA probably anticipated that giving prominence to black people in its coverage could alienate its overwhelmingly white and most likely conservative readership.

The conservatism of the SA government at the time *People* SA launched in the late 1980s is important to consider for other reasons, notably the introduction of television, and the impact that has on the way the magazine represented fame. For years, the apartheid government protected (especially white) South Africans "against what were seen as the behaviours representing the disintegrative effects of modernity", Jonathan Hyslop (2000) argues. This campaign included a number of measures aimed at controlling the daily life of South Africans, including intensified "censorship […] on the cultural and political front", the banning of certain kinds of music from state radio, "draconian measures against drug abuse", a "legal clampdown on homosexuality" and, crucially, a refusal to introduce television (Hyslop 2000: 38). Consequently, despite television being introduced to countries such as the United States and Britain as early as the 1930s, it was only introduced on a commercial scale in South Africa in 1976.

Television was much maligned by the South African government (Nixon, 1993; Hyslop, 2000),[80] and for the same reason Hollywood stars were often criticised: for being instrumental in moral decay.[81] The United States, home of the Hollywood film industry, and exclusive supplier of television programming broadcasted in South Africa at the time *People*

[80] Television was extensively vilified by members of the South African National Party in defence of the government ban of the medium up until 1976 (Nixon 1993), as it was feared that foreign programming would expose South African viewers to "unwanted liberal influences" (Hyslop 2000). Dr Albert Hertzog, Minister of Post and Telecommunications at the time of the ban, for instance, called the medium "spiritual *dagga*", a "school for crime", "that evil black box: sickly, mawkish, sentimentalistic, and leading to dangerous liberalistic tendencies". Hertzog is also said to have warned that "inside the pill [of television] there is the bitter poison which will ultimately mean the downfall of civilizations" (as quoted in Nixon 1993).

[81] The introduction to a 2002 survey of global television in *The Economist* (2002) notes that: "Television continues to enjoy a robust hold on the popular imagination. There are few social phenomena, pernicious or benign, for which television is not being held responsible by someone or other: the stifling of children's imagination, the increase in obesity, the decline of the family meal, the erosion of morality, the vulgarisation of taste, the worship of celebrity, the promotion of violence, the undermining of authority, the maintenance of American cultural hegemony—and the spread of democracy".

SA was launched, was cast as the "dominant source of cultural imperialism" (Nixon 1993: 121). Thus, it is to be imagined that there might be an expectation that the entertainers associated with this medium would somehow be representatives of the 'moral decay' that television was supposed to symbolise. Details of their less-than-perfect private lives, as documented in South Africa by magazines such as *People*, could thus be viewed as further 'evidence' of the rot spread by the medium of television.

3.1 *Emerging Celebrity* unpacked

Maligned or not, television certainly loomed large on the cover of the very first issue of *People* SA, which is dated 27 May 1987, and could be read as an indication to the readership that personalities from the 'small screen' would be included in the magazine's editorial mix. Supported by a dramatic red, white and black colour palette, sensational cover lines 'scream', mostly in all capital letters: "*BARNARD BOMBSHELL: CHRIS, 62, SET TO WED KAREN, 22*", "*Bizarre secrets of Charles' and Di's marriage*", "*NEW PROOF UFO'S* [sic] *ARE REAL*", "*I WAS EATEN ALIVE AND SURVIVED*", *"Beer and wine are good for you"*, *"NEW HOPE FOR HEADACHE SUFFERERS"*, *"Mr T turns lawyer"*, *"Higgins falls for 'Murder She Wrote' sleuth"*.

The main (full-colour) image is of a smiling Chris and Karin, and inset secondary images are full-colour portraits of the man who claimed to have been eaten alive and of John Hillerman (who played Higgins in TV series *Magnum, P.I.*). There are eight cover lines, plus a promotion of a competition to "*WIN A WEEK AT THE WILD COAST SUN*" and three photographs – all in stark contrast to the covers of the early and mid-20th-century magazines analysed in the previous two chapters. The 1950s *Drum* and early 20th century *Huisgenoot* covers generally had only one image, and cover lines were sparse. Even though *People* SA is not exclusively a showbusiness-personality magazine, at least four of the cover lines refer to famous people, or characters from television series. Less page space and fewer words devoted to each personality or couple, a growing trend in showbusiness journalism as the 20th century progressed, meant the opportunity to include more of these personalities in any one issue at a time.

It also meant less page space was devoted to each personality inside the magazine, compared to magazine coverage earlier in the century. Comprising a temporal 'hook', *People* SA's cover stories were generally allotted a maximum of one page inside the magazine, while features, which were not time-bound, sometimes spanned more pages. This

diminishing page count allocated to each personality's story is an indication of how the approach to coverage had changed over time. Where early and mid-20th-century magazines tended to cover life stories in lengthy features spanning multiple pages, the trend in the last decades of the century seemed to be to allocate fewer pages and, crucially, move towards covering cover 'story arcs' within the life story. These story arcs are short (spanning a few weeks at most), episodic and refer to time-bound, 'newsy' events, or those currently taking place in a personality's life.

This is crucial, as this trend towards coverage of story arcs would continue into the new millennium. *People* SA in the 1980s still included 'life story' coverage of entertainers in its editorial mix, but these life stories were afforded fewer pages and were also combined with coverage of story arcs, about entertainment personalities' private lives. The magazine's bi-weekly publication frequency enabled the publication of time-bound news. *People*'s approach is in stark contrast to that of 1950s *Drum*, which sometimes devoted multiple pages at a time to the various aspects of the life story of a single entertainer over several monthly issues, as we saw with the serialised Dolly Rathebe coverage. The news element was also entirely missing from early 20th-century *Huisgenoot* hagiographies, which were the result of largely posthumous coverage and the magazine's dedicated focus at the time on the epic, which necessarily implied the element of a life story or a long journey.

The *People* SA cover style undoubtedly announced this new publication on the South African market as part of the tradition of 'tabloid journalism'. This influence is significant, as it helps to explain the move, at this point, towards content pointing out imperfection and portraying behaviour as flawed. John Merrill (2005) notes that the term 'tabloid' originally exclusively referred to the format. Tabloids are roughly half the size of their bigger 'broadsheet' newspaper counterparts, which makes the former easier to read on public transport. But the idea of tabloid journalism has also come to presuppose a specific kind of content, focused on "sensational, splashy entertainment journalism. Big headlines, gaudy and often lurid pictures. A minimum of text and a maximum of photographs. And colour. And bizarre stories, sexy women, and *scandal* and gossip" (Merrill, 2005: 264, emphasis added). The "lurid pictures" and "minimum of text and maximum of photographs" (*Ibid*.) would only really become entrenched in the South African media landscape in the 21st century, when the first official local tabloid newspaper was launched here, as Herman Wasserman (2006) notes, but *People* undoubtedly paved the way by featuring the rest of the characteristic

tabloid elements: the big headlines, the gaudiness, the colour, the bizarre stories and, most importantly here, the focus on scandal.

Jostein Grisprud (in Strelitz 2006, no page number) points out that besides sensationalism, the tabloid industry also has a proclivity for "personalisation, and the focus on private concerns". This "focus on private concerns" (Grisprud in Strelitz, 2006, no page number) is evident in the cover line promoting the article on local cardiac surgeon Dr Chris Barnard ("*BARNARD BOMBSHELL: CHRIS, 62, SET TO WED KAREN, 22*") and raises the second reason the cover of the launch issue of *People* SA is significant. The main cover image and cover headline comprised a person who, in years gone by, would primarily have featured in the media for actions and specifically achievements in his professional/public life, namely performing the world's first heart transplant, in 1967, twenty years before *People* was launched. In other words, earlier in the 20th century, the coverage of Barnard would arguably have focused on his pioneering work in the field of cardiac medicine and configured him as *Epic Hero* for using his extraordinary talent and skill for the greater good, for the advancement of the field of medicine and for South Africa's reputation alike.

People's choice of Barnard as the main cover subject for its launch issue, combined with the approach the coverage takes, can be seen as an indication of the transitional nature of the figure we encounter in weekly magazines at the time. On the one hand, there is the clear acknowledgement of the epic, the main driver of magazine coverage of individuals in the early years of the 20th century. The *choice* of Barnard pays homage to the figure of the *Epic Hero*. However, the focus and style of the *People* coverage, clearly departed from the earlier magazine's representations. This is because the coverage focused almost exclusively on his private rather than his public life.

Of all the various aspects of private life, it is the romantic, and eventually the sexual, that is usually most compelling, with Robert Toll (1982) pointing out how high-profile Hollywood couplings set the trend in the fan magazines by attracting most attention. Hollywood's legacy ensured that relationships, specifically if both partners had publicised private lives, were some of the main narratives through which well-known figures were represented in magazines of the late 20th century and beyond, as is evident in the *People* coverage of Dr Barnard and his fiancée, model Karin Setzkorn. The cover of the launch issue already indicated that the focus of the article would be on the couple rather than exclusively on Barnard, the more famous partner at the time. And the admittedly repetitive inside article delivers on this promise; there is no mention of any public-life information other than

identifying Barnard as a "*world-famous heart surgeon*",[82] and the dedicated focus is clearly on the relationship and the impending nuptials.

The lead story *People* ran with in its launch issue in 1987 could easily be classified as conforming to the typical coverage afforded to entertainment personalities from the early 20th century onwards. Yet there are a few subtle indications that the article in the launch issue, which arguably set the tone for the way *People* produced its specific brand of fame, could be considered as indicative of a threshold moment between the *Star* and the *Emerging Celebrity*.

Retrospectively, it is interesting to see how *People*'s 1980s portrayal of Chris Barnard as hybrid figure with endured well after his death in 2001. In an article marking the 50th anniversary of the historic first heart transplant, Marina Joubert (2017), for instance, argues that, "Barnard remains the only South African scientist who ever achieved global celebrity status". She notes that:

> His celebrity status was boosted by his unique blend of charisma, media flair and boyish good looks. Barnard sustained it in years to come by his high-profile private life, public engagements with royalty and world leaders, as well as a series of flirtations with models and movie stars. (Joubert 2017)

Let us consider the details of *People*'s representation of Barnard the *Emerging Celebrity*. First there is the alliterative indication rendered in uppercase typeface on the cover of the magazine: "*BARNARD BOMBSHELL*", with its associated meanings of something surprising, amazing or sensational, and its colloquial use to describe a person, usually a woman, who is considered very attractive. The term "*bombshell*" has strong connections to tabloid journalism. Using this term to promote the lead article on the cover of its launch issue is an indication of *People* SA's editorial vision.

With its cover's word choice, the magazine arguably sent a message that its intention was to give preference to an element of surprise, shock or sensationalism in its news selection. By extension then, it can also be read as an indication of the kind of figure that it would use to convey this kind of journalism. Its readers, in other words, could expect stories about people doing shocking, surprising and sensational things. Although the Barnard cover lines almost pre-empt their readers' shock by merely suggesting or hinting at what it actually is that

[82] Morris, Rose, "*BOMBSHELL! CHRIS, 62, TO WED KAREN, 22*", *People*, 27 May 1987.

might cause the brouhaha, for the 20th-century trajectory of fame, they herald an important shift in how famous figures were represented.

As indicated on the cover page, the lead story's element of shock lies in the big age difference between Chris and Karin. Big age differences in famous couples continue to be covered in the media as sensational, especially, perhaps, where it concerns an element of the heroic or the model,[83] as it suggests a deviation from general societal expectation. Barnard proves himself as a transitional figure in this way, depicted as exemplary in terms of his professional life but much less so in his private life, especially in terms of his romantic relationships. Not only did he have multiple marriages, but he also had a preference for women much younger than himself.[84] In conservative 1980s white South Africa, which was still culturally isolated thanks to the government's divisive apartheid policies,[85] a third marriage, and one that involved a substantial age gap, could successfully be 'spun' or manipulated by the magazine to evoke concern, shock and even perhaps outrage amongst its readership. What is considered controversial or scandalous is influenced by the "prevailing norms and expectations", John B. Thompson (1995: 145) reminds us:

> Scandals generally presuppose sets of norms or expectations which are contravened or transgressed by the activities in question, and with reference to the activities, once disclosed, are denounced. These norms and expectations vary from one social-historical context to another. Hence what counts as scandalous, and the extent of the damage that it can cause to an individual or administration, will depend on the prevailing norms and expectations.

The second way in which the Barnard cover story marks a shift away from the *Star* and towards a different representation of fame concerns the notions of ordinariness and extraordinariness. Specifically, what could be gathered from the Barnard story is that the latter notion, extraordinariness, could be interpreted as being more complex by being associated not only with positive elements such as talent, perfection and exemplariness and so forth but also with extremity and excess that could be viewed as alarming. There is something extreme and extraordinary about Barnard's *three* marriages, two of them failed by the time *People* launched, as well as those substantial age gaps between him and his

[83] The twenty-five-year age difference between Canadian president Emmanuel Macron and his wife, Brigitte, was for instance widely covered as controversial in 2017.
[84] His second marriage had been to Barbara Zoellner, in 1970. She was nineteen (the same age as his son from his first marriage), and he forty-eight.
[85] See, for instance, Hyslop (2000) and Malan (1991).

second and third wives, which are all elements of the story being emphasised on the cover of the launch issue of *People*, as well as in the article inside the magazine.

As is visible in the Barnard coverage, a deliberate emphasis on the intersection of the idea of an element of extraordinariness with the notion of the imperfect or the flawed appears to start characterising weekly magazine coverage towards the end of the 20th century. This could be construed as a departure from coverage surfacing extraordinariness in terms of positive elements such as elevation, distance, talent, distinctiveness and so forth, which could rather be classified as surfacing the *Star* and not the Celebrity figure.

Not only is there evidence of a shift away from the *Star* in the Barnard coverage, there also appears to be a foreshadowing of the *Celebrity Proper* figure, and this supports the claim that the *Emerging Celebrity* is a transitional understanding. The foreshadowing is evident in what appears to be an (perhaps awkward) attempt at irony and humour in the way the article is presented. Specifically, it concerns the combination of a personal anecdote from Karin used in the article, which again points to the age difference between the partners, and the selection of the main photograph accompanying the article. The anecdote reads:

> *Karen still treasures the photograph she has of a youthful-looking Chris Barnard dandling a little girl on his knee. The photograph was taken when Chris was 46. The smiling little girl on his knee was Karen. Little did she know that in a mere 16 years she would be walking down the aisle with him*.[86]

It is the coupling of this anecdote in the copy with the main 'holding' image, showing a now-adult Karin again seated on Chris's lap, with his arms around her waist and his hands clasped over hers on her belly, in what looks like the lounge of their private home, that suggests an ironic reading. The caption even explicitly connects the anecdote in the article with the styling of the posed image: "*Wife-to-be number three Karen, the child he used to dandle on his knee*". Gamson (2001: 275) notes that irony is "one of the clearest later twentieth century developments" in magazine coverage, with the readership "invited to take […] a new, cynical distance from the production of celebrity and celebrity images". It appears as if 1980s *People* used irony sparingly and in a relatively understated way when it did, especially compared to magazine coverage of the early years of the 21st century, yet it is present and a distinguishing characteristic of the coverage that can be categorised as surfacing the Celebrity phenomenon.

[86] Morris, Rose, "*BOMBSHELL! CHRIS, 62, TO WED KAREN, 22*", *People*, 27 May 1987.

Barring the above, the coverage evinces an apparent absence of scepticism on the part of journalist Rose Morris, who accepts Karin's personal confession to her that she is "*really in love with Chris Barnard and he loves me*" and quotes an anonymous friend who agrees by saying, "*There is no doubt Chris is the great love of* [Karen's] *life*" and yet another claiming, "*They love one another very much*." With the anonymous friends' contributions we see gossip continuing to serve coverage surfacing the *Emerging Celebrity*, as it had done with the *Star*. In other words, gossip continues to be a device of choice for showbusiness journalists long after the fanzines had first employed it.

Karin is not the only one who is portrayed as being genuinely in love, judging by the article's concluding paragraph, which claims that Chris, "*was a shattered man* [after his second divorce] *but time and Karen's love have healed the wounds. Now it seems he has found the woman with whom he can happily spend his declining years*".

Given the fact that this was conservative 1980s South Africa, and his marriage to Karin would be his third, much more could arguably have been made of Chris's many failed relationships and the imperfection and unhappiness being suggested in these details. Yet *People* buries his controversial romantic history in the last few paragraphs of its article, which in traditional news-story structure theories would indicate its low priority, with priority traditionally dwindling as the story progresses. Beyond the 'knee-dandling' photograph and the relatively obvious paradox in the narrative of a 'maker' of hearts in his public life being a serial breaker of hearts at home, there is very little irony and scepticism to be traced in the rest of the story. The rumours of his infidelity to second wife Barbara Zoellner are mentioned, for instance, but swiftly dismissed with his own apparent explanation that, "*The truth of the matter is that I was sick and the girl was visiting me. She was sitting on the foot of the bed and it was in broad daylight*". The rather understated expression of human fallibility in the *People* coverage, despite the fact that the story obviously presents much more opportunity for this kind of emphasis, predicts the much more explicit use of storylines focused on imperfection and flaw in the way magazines cover personalities going into the 21st century.

New-millennium coverage would also strongly come to be characterised by an exploration of the personalities' inner psychological lives. There is perhaps evidence of movement in that direction in this article on Chris and Karin in *People*, but it is still arguably in the early stages, as there seems to be scope for much deeper analysis of her decision to marry a man more than forty years older than her on the one hand, and, on the other, his apparent tendency to

woo much younger and specifically highly attractive, high-profile women. (Barbara was an heiress and Karin a model.) "*Karen has always been open about her feelings for Chris*", Morris writes, before giving a rather superficial overview of the emotions she experienced after meeting Chris for the first time:

> *"I had just left school when I first met Chris. My friends said I was crazy, that I was throwing my life away on a man much older than myself.*
> *"Now they have changed their ideas and they really all like him.*
> *"The age gap doesn't matter at all to us.*
> *"He is a very young man at heart.*
> *"We think the same way. He understands how I feel about things. We do everything together.*
> *"I travel with him everywhere he goes."*

One could convincingly argue that the magazine avoided scepticism, a seemingly critical approach or 'deep' psychological analysis in writing this local story, possibly in order to maintain good relations with two individuals in the very small and limited community of local personalities and ensure their willingness to cooperate with the magazine in future. An existing relationship with Karin is already clear from Morris's comment that the former had "*told me some time ago*" that Chris was her one true love.

Establishing and maintaining productive and sustainable relationships with entertainment personalities, in order to ensure their ongoing cooperation and, crucially, divulgence of preferably exclusive, intimate and hopefully controversial details of their private lives, were the 'tricks of the trade' of entertainment journalism towards the turn of the 20th century. It has been argued that maintaining good relations with current and potential subjects are the most important mechanics of good journalism per se, not just Celebrity or entertainment journalism and these mechanics have arguably *always* characterised entertainment journalism and did not only emerge towards the end of the century. And while these claims are certainly justifiable, it is important to consider the kind of challenge it has always been to create and sustain the very specific, symbiotic relationship between reporter/writer/profiler and entertainment personality required by modern showbusiness media with its seeming preference for exposing imperfection and bad behaviour.

The 'job specification' for entertainment writers has perhaps grown organically from the 1950s onwards, when the Hollywood film studio oligopoly ended via court order, and film actors became "proprietors of their own image" (King in Gamson, 2001: 12) instead of

relying on the production studio with whom they held a contract to prescribe what their public image should be and control the damage if any deviation was ever revealed. As the Hollywood studio system was dismantled, Sternheimer (2011: 148) writes, the entertainers "lost access to the tightly run publicity machine, which not only controlled their images, but also protected them from bad publicity", which implied, amongst other things, that they had very little control over the release of material relating to misbehaviour.

Probably acutely aware of their legacy as the main architects of the image of the entertainment personality ever since the first Hollywood fanzine had been launched, the entertainment media from the 1950s onwards were suddenly free to expose the kind of detail the studios had kept hidden for fear of 'bad publicity' and dwindling film-ticket sales. Some of these publications, the above-mentioned *Confidential* being one of the main pioneers, exclusively specialised in content exposing entertainment-personality misbehaviour and controversy.

Others deliberately eschewed all scandal. Launching in the 1940s, Spanish weekly personality-news magazine *¡Hola!*, for instance, deliberately chose not to change its editorial preference for positive stories on the private lives of entertainers following the dismantling of the Hollywood film industry. Launched in the 1970s, *¡Hola!*'s UK-based franchise, *Hello!*, followed suit, as did the original US edition of *People*. With its editorial focus on positive entertainment stories and a strategic editorial decision to exclude exposés of scandalous behaviour for the most part, it is not surprising that *People* US has been described, by Sternheimer (2011) and others, as a replacement for the by now-defunct Hollywood fanzines. The US edition of *People* has been one of the leading magazines to cloak "the appeal to voyeurism – the very most attractive, albeit shameful, aspect of tabloid journalism – in the respectable clothes of personality journalism. It was not embarrassing to read these publications […] because they were ostensibly upright, positive", Anne Helen Petersen (2011: 229–230) writes in her historical account of the gossip industry in the United States.

At the other end of the Celebrity-manufacturing process, the entertainment personalities themselves started to employ a variety of professionals to manage their images. Quoting Balio, Gamson (2001: 12) provides an exhaustive overview of the range of film-industry role-players that suddenly emerged following the "shake-up of the [Hollywood] movie studio system" in the 1940s and 1950s: independent production companies, studios that now contracted actors on a picture-by-picture basis rather than owning them for long periods of time, and talent agents. "While the economic drive toward a star system remained in this

changed environment, new players entered the game from the now-dispersed sub-industries of star-making and from the new [in the United States] television industry, and strategies began to shift to meet the new environmental requirements", Gamson (2001: 12) writes.

These shifting strategies necessarily included entertainment journalists, the entertainers themselves as well as their support contingent (agents and, more recently, representatives and publicists) carefully carving out agreements on how to represent and perhaps even co-produce the Celebrity image that was eventually presented to the public, agreements that would satisfy both the entertainment media by increasing readership and the personalities themselves by growing their exposure and subsequent popularity. Agreements were most likely negotiated over time and culminated in an understanding that content purporting to reveal the authentic, real and ordinary of the entertainment personality's private self, which necessarily included exposure of flaw and imperfection, was lucrative for the media. But, if correctly managed, this kind of content could also be manipulated to increase the allure of the personalities.

It could be argued that the more textured coverage found in the entertainment media of the early 21st century is an indication of a mature, established, symbiotic relationship that existed between entertainment journalists, now widely called Celebrity journalists, and the personalities they covered. By the 21st century, there would even be tertiary education courses dedicated to the discipline of Celebrity journalism, as Howard Altman (2010) points out. Altman's discussion includes an account of the kind of curriculum covered in one of these Celebrity journalism courses, which was taught at the Central Michigan University in Mt. Pleasant by Lorrie Lynch, then an editor at *USA Weekend*, and which reveals the uniquely challenging nature of the discipline: "Lynch […] will cover celebrity journalism ranging from staged events to uncovering scandal, including figuring out how celebrities' publicity operations work and meeting stars' demands without abandoning journalistic integrity" (Altman 2010: 18).

Yet in a time before Celebrity journalism university courses and the more polished coverage of the early 21st century, entertainment media and personalities alike were still negotiating their respective positions now that there was no more integrated Hollywood film-production industry to protect them. While they were jostling to reach some kind of agreement, there were still magazines to be produced and entertainment-personality images to be circulated, which meant that magazines of the late 20th century produced a rather crude and rough

first version of something that would become much more refined. Hence the insistence in this thesis that the Celebrity understanding of fame that emerges around the turn of the century be divided into two categories.

If the international entertainment media industry found it difficult to manage their relationships with the personalities they covered in the late 20th century, how much more so the nascent South African entertainment media fraternity. This was the pre-internet era, and South Africa was still culturally isolated, so exposure to international media and Celebrity coverage was severely limited. So Rose Morris, the writer of the Barnard article, and her colleagues at *People* SA and its (few) local competitors, must have found it extremely challenging to understand the mechanics of this new understanding of fame that was only starting to emerge on the international entertainment-media landscape.

The *People* SA staff could not even revert to the magazine's eponymous parent brand in the United States for guidance since, from the outset, the local magazine's editorial vision deviated substantially from that of *People* US, possibly an intentional strategy to take advantage of a clear gap on the local entertainment-magazine market for scandal-driven content, which seemed to boost sales in the United States. The public-relations campaign promoting the launch of *People* US in 1974 emphasised the magazine's focus on "people, not issues" (*Time*, 1974) and specifically "OPP: other people's problems" (Stolley, in Sternheimer 2011: 191). Yet unlike *People* SA, *People* US rarely carried content revealing scandal. In keeping with the tradition started by its fanzine predecessors, *People* US strived to maintain amicable relationships with its famous subjects, Sternheimer (2011) points out. This continues to be the status quo at *People* US today, which is one reason the magazine often manages to secure exclusive rights to first photographs of significant life-events such as weddings and births. It has laid claim to a weekly readership in excess of 46 million, the largest audience of any American magazine.

With what seems to be a decision to deviate from the editorial focus of the eponymous brand in the United States and little guidance from the rest of the international entertainment-media industry in terms of the mechanics of this emerging form of Celebrity journalism, it comes as no surprise that *People* SA in its early years rather opted to avoid being too critical of or sceptical about the small circle of local entertainment personalities it probably hoped to include in its coverage going forward. This decision often meant scant coverage of local personalities, a trend that persisted into 21st-century SA Celebrity journalism, and that implied a fairly straight reading, so no (or at least very little) irony.

The element of irony is one of the key distinguishing factors between *Emerging Celebrity* and its more radicalised successor. Tracing how entertainers are covered in the US media over the 20th century, Gamson (2001: 14) notes how in the later decades of the century, "The discourse [in print media] brought about an increasing self-consciousness and irony about celebrity". He precedes this statement by explaining that the self-consciousness and irony emerges as a result of the entry of several new elements into the fame discourse; these include the exposure of the mechanisms used to represent fame, the acknowledgement and even embrace of fame as a "commercial enterprise" and the fact that the audience "has been invited to increase its knowledge and power" of and over entertainers.

The textual evidence gathered for this project seem to show that in South African weekly magazines, too, one could identify the entry of a specific set of elements into the representation of fame and the subsequent increase in "self-consciousness and irony about celebrity" (Gamson, 2001: 14). However, irony and self-consciousness only became a regular feature of local Celebrity journalism in the 21st century. This realisation partly influenced the categorisation and specifically the decision to propose two Celebrity categories in the trajectory: *Emerging Celebrity*, in which irony is largely absent or not easily discerned, and its radicalised successor, which strongly relies upon the ironic in its representation and production of fame.

Setting the tone for *People* SA's representation of well-knownness, the lead article in the magazine's launch issue allows for one final conclusion about the *Emerging Celebrity*. This observation concerns the idea of ephemerality. Discussions of fame usually tend to consider how temporary or permanent an individual's well-knownness is, and this matter is very often connected to the reason for gaining fame in the first instance.

This link between what it was that attracted fame in the first place and the lifespan of the public attention paid to the well-known figure definitely seems to emerge in the material gathered and analysed for this thesis. The large scope, almost a whole century's worth of magazines, allows the observation that the idea of the temporary becomes part of the way in which fame is represented: how it becomes more pronounced, and also how it seems to be linked to the reason for fame in the first instance.

In the early 20th-century magazines, fame is generally presented as something that is infinite. Most of the coverage is posthumous, with this celebration of life only after death being a characteristic element of the heroic, as has been pointed out by many including, among others, Wallace (1994) and Drucker and Cathcart (1994). The fact that the individual

is mostly celebrated posthumously seemed to be the magazine's way of indicating that even after life has ended, legacy, and thus fame, survives.

And then, arguably from the time the Hollywood marketing machine was dreamt up, the *Star* figure was criticised for not 'meriting' the fame that was bestowed upon them and merely being "well-known for [their] well-knownness", to use Daniel Boorstin's (1971) often-cited description. And despite subsequent predictions that their fame would be short-lived, the names of the stars from Hollywood's so-called glamorous 'golden years' do generally live on: Jean Harlow, Fred Astaire, Lucille Ball, Ingrid Bergman, Marlon Brando and many more. The same can be said for Dorothy Masuka, Dolly Rathebe and the other local *Star* figures selected to explore *Drum* magazine's contribution to the 20th-century trajectory of well-knownness. Thanks in part to a revival of the glory days of *Drum* magazine, following the dawn of democracy in the country in 1994, the legacy of these entertainers is still being celebrated well into the 21st century.

By contrast, typical well-knownness from the turn of the 20th century seems to display a constantly growing element of the ephemeral, as Chris Rojek (2001: 20) has suggested, venturing to call these personalities enjoying fleeting fame "celetoids":

> I propose celetoid as the term for any form of compressed, concentrated, attributed celebrity. I distinguish celetoids from celebrities because, generally, the latter enjoy a more durable career with the public.

In his etymological discussion of the word 'celebrity', Marshall (1997: 6) also alludes to the connection between ephemerality and modern understandings of fame, drawing, interestingly, the connection between the word and the Latin word *celere*, which means swift or fleeting.

The inclusion of model Karin Setzkorn in the lead article of *People* SA's launch issue can be read as an early indication of an element of ephemerality in the *Emerging Celebrity*. Although the 1980s is admittedly a time when models internationally were making small gains in the fame stakes,[87] the local beauty was relatively unknown, save for her relationship

[87] Much to the dismay of fame detractors such as Joseph Epstein (2005), the 1980s was a time when models made some gains in the fame stakes, probably thanks to the term 'supermodel' becoming prominent in popular culture at the time. But the gains included little more than name billing; rather than endure the obscurity of anonymity, the models now became known by their full names. Some names, including Christie Brinkley, Margaux Hemingway, Paulina Porizkova, Yasmin Le Bon and Brooke Shields, amongst others, became known internationally, earning these models the 'supermodel' designation. This name billing was an important moment in the modelling industry,

with Chris Barnard, of course. In fact, her relative obscurity might explain, at least partially, why the *People* SA lead story consistently misspelled her actual name Karin as Karen. As her fame was based on her relationship and never really developed any further, it was of very short duration. Not only did *People* SA opt to lead its launch issue with a story that included a relatively obscure personality and, importantly, feature her on its cover, its inside article was also predominantly presented from her perspective, relying on gossip from her mother, her friends and a personal interview with author Rose Morris. This could be interpreted as *People* SA's attempt at introducing her to its readership and building her image. But it could also be an indication that the magazine's approach to fame did not always rely on a personality's staying power and that it was willing to accept a modicum of ephemerality as part of the greater fame package it represented.

People SA's launch issue might have led with a story about a couple happily in love and about to get married. But it was also clear from the launch that these fairy-tale characters, the suggestion of infidelity and inappropriate age difference notwithstanding, are not the only cast members contributing to the late 20th-century understanding of well-knownness. In fact, the contrast could not be more pronounced: the Barnard-Setzkorn lead story appears on a page opposite an article on the demise of arguably *the* fairy-tale marriage of the century, that of the Prince and Princess of Wales. These two relationship articles on one spread can be read as a good example of what the new understanding of fame comprised: coverage of the private life and, moreover, exposure of elements of imperfection, flaw (failed relationships) and hints of transgression (suggested infidelity) in this space. With this new form of fame emerges a new figure, one that distinguishes itself from its star predecessor by being represented as imperfect and flawed.

Also promoted on the cover of the launch issue, this article on the UK's Prince Charles and Princess Diana[88] is a good example of typical late 20th-century magazine coverage. With the headline "*Different interests, different friends – separate lives: INTIMATE SECRETS OF CHARLES AND DI'S BIZARRE MARRIAGE*", the article focuses mainly on their private relationship and specifically on the marital problems they were rumoured to be having at the time. The inclusion of words such as 'intimate' and 'secrets' and even the tabloid

---

reminiscent of the time in early Hollywood film history when, as Toll (1982) explains, the production studios realised the potential value of releasing the names of their contracted lead actors. Yet unlike in Hollywood, where name billing could be said to have represented one of the first steps in the construction of the 'star system', model name billing, for the most part, did not herald the entry of the model into the world of the star, which was built upon private-life publicisation.

[88] "*Different interests, different friends – separate lives: INTIMATE SECRETS OF CHARLES AND DI'S BIZARRE MARRIAGE*", *People*, 27 May 1987.

buzzword 'bizarre' in the bold type of the headline set up an expectation of the revelation of the salacious, most private details of their relationship; yet the story itself is reserved. It focuses, rather, on the idea that there is a concerted effort to avoid sensation and scandal:

> *The royal couple have very little in common and find many of the other's interests totally boring, say palace insiders.*
> *But, to avoid scandal, they will maintain their bizarre marriage by driving different cars, seeing different friends and spending little time together, except on official duties.*
> *"They have come to a very special and civilised agreement to allow the princess more time to herself," says royal expert Harold Brooks-Baker.*

The focus on separate lives and interests in this story surfaces the idea of miscalculation and misjudgement on the part of the partners. The story also contains actual transgression in terms of rumoured infidelity, but this is not emphasised in the 'display copy'[89] and is also given a less prominent position further down in the story itself. The possibility of infidelity is also softened through contextualisation in terms of their thirteen-year age difference. This contextualisation and explanation is evident in this quote in the story from Earl Clancarthet, described as a palace insider and confidant of the royal family:

> *"Charles is 38 going on 50 […] The sad fact is that he has never been young.*
> *"Charles has been increasingly irritated by Diana's flirting at parties – which is no more than the harmless exuberance of a young woman."*

The earl uses the word 'sad' to describe the fact that Prince Charles had never really been a young man. Combined with the focus on the civilised way in which the separation is being conducted, the surfacing of sadness in this storyline in a way closes up the possibility for a full, truly scandalous, sensational exposé.

Moreover, there is also an absence of visual evidence to support the rumours of infidelity. The story reveals that, "*Di's bodyguard was moved to a new job because he was reportedly becoming too close to her*" and identifies him as the "*handsome policeman Harry Manikee*",[90] yet there are no photographs of him or of the two of them together to support these claims. The only photograph that accompanies the article can be described as

[89] The term 'display copy' refers to text that is emphasised through larger typeface size, bolding or contrasting colour. Typically, this would be the headline or title of the article, the 'blurb' or brief paragraph linking the headline with the article itself (which also often contains the author credit), citations from the body copy and captions.
[90] The correct name is actually Barry Manikee, but *People* misspelled it.

illustrative of the reported estrangement rather than as evidence of any specific transgression; it shows the couple in public, assumedly at an official event, side by side but looking away from each other and the camera, and the idea of separation is exacerbated with a the visual device of a tear-mark superimposed onto the photograph, between the two partners. The fact that the coverage lacks visual evidence of transgression is one of the reasons why it can be categorised as surfacing *Emerging Celebrity* rather than its successor.

I also identify the *Emerging Celebrity* in this story based on the contextualising comments from the earl and also 'royal expert' Harold Brooks-Baker and a second "*palace insider*", Baron Tollemache, which can be seen as very early indications of the kind of 'psychologisation' that would increasingly come to characterise Celebrity journalism going into the 21st century and subsequently surface the *Celebrity Proper*.

This Prince Charles and Princess Diana story was selected to provide evidence for the argument that the *Emerging Celebrity* category is above all a tentative one that in essence prepares for its successor. The exploration of the psyche of the personality is only just beginning, and although there are clear indications of flaw and imperfection in the private realm, they are for the most part not supported visually and often not emphasised or fully explored. There is a discernible focus on what is portrayed as imperfection and transgression in coverage of the *Celebrity Proper* figure, and the magazine coverage of the *Emerging Celebrity* prepares the way with an arguably more discreet approach. Sternheimer (2011) found that towards the end of the 20th century, the media generally started opting for tales of heartbreak, illness, loneliness, divorce, adultery, single parenthood and children born out of wedlock, alongside the occasional idealisation of nuptials. In other words, only occasionally do we find a glimpse of glamour in entertainment-personality coverage. And from the evidence in *People* and other local magazines covering showbusiness personalities, the South African media seemed have follow this global trend.

Physical 'imperfection'

In addition to stories about broken lives and promises, the notion of supposed physical imperfection is essential to how the *Celebrity Proper* is represented. Thanks to paparazzi photography, magazines of the 21st century would come to use photographic 'evidence' to reveal these 'imperfections', which arguably do not translate as convincingly into textual description. Yet before we get to this more radical exposure of supposed physical imperfection, it is made explicit in late 20th-century magazine texts. A *People* article from

1987 entitled "*NOBODY'S PERFECT – NOT EVEN THESE FAMOUS FACES*" is a good example.[91] Spanning two pages, the article features photographs mostly illustrating the questionable make-up choices of a handful of women including Donna Mills and *Dallas*'s Morgan Brittany. A black-and-white photograph purports to show singer Cher "*before her beauty treatment*" with "*a complexion like a gravel pit*", at least according to outspoken make-up artist Stan Place, the article's main source. The article notes that Place "*is make-up director for the Miss Universe, Miss USA and Miss Teen USA pageants and has worked on such stars as Lynda Carter, Kim Basinger, Susan Dey and Lauren Hutton*". Another photograph of Cher, notably in full colour instead of the black and white of the 'before' picture, which looks suspiciously like it was taken *years* before, this time supposedly *after* her beauty treatment, elicits the comment from Place that the singer looks "*Strikingly beautiful*".

The article encourages readers, by addressing them directly, to "*TAKE heart: Nobody's perfect – not even Hollywood's most stunning women*". The direct address is sparingly used in this article, and indeed in *People* SA generally at this point, yet it should be noted, as it goes some distance towards preparing for how *Celebrity Proper* will be presented, the latter making abundant use of this literary technique. The growing use of this technique in magazines going into the 21st century is interesting, as 'breaking the fourth wall' in this way is generally thought of as an acknowledgement to the reader or audience in theatre that what they are being presented with is fictional. It is also employed in order to relax the borders of the fiction being presented and to include the reader in the fictional scenario or community.

It could also be interpreted as another indication and confirmation of the presence of some of the elements Gamson (2001: 13) identifies as entering representations of fame towards the end of the 20th century, notably the exposure of "the mechanisms by which images are made and by which celebrity is built" and the invitation to the audience "to increase its knowledge and power". In the "*NOBODY'S PERFECT*" article, the emphasis on the supposed physical imperfections of the stars can be read as a subtle invitation to the *People* SA reader to grow their "knowledge and power" of the entertainers who usually appear so picture-perfect. The use of the direct address here can be read as a hint to the *People* SA reader to take cognisance of the possibility that what is being presented here is fictional. This identification of a possibility of fiction is not as pronounced or self-evident in *People* SA in the late 20th century, but it can undoubtedly be said to have prepared the way for *Celebrity*

[91] "*NOBODY'S PERFECT – NOT EVEN THESE FAMOUS FACES*", *People*, December 1987.

Proper, which, to use Gamson's (2001: 18–19) words, enlightens readers about the "falseness of celebrity" and "the disruptive notion that there is nothing behind a fabricated, performed image but layers of other fabricated, performed images".

The use of direct address in *People* SA can also be read as indicative of an early attempt at creating a fictionalised 'family-like' community that includes the magazine, the entertainment personalities themselves as well as the readers: what Joke Hermes (1995: 127) calls the "extended-family repertoire". This sense of community, which is also fostered by the article's focus on the kinds of flaws (bushy eyebrows like Brooke Shields, crossed eyes and scrawniness like Joan van Ark) and misjudgements (unfortunate make-up choices, although that might just be the beauty-burden of the 1980s?) readers share with the entertainers, again emphasises ordinariness.

It must be noted, however, that although a sense of ordinariness can be derived from the *NOBODY'S PERFECT* article, it is still relatively subtle, especially compared to coverage that can be classified as exemplary of the *Celebrity Proper*. This subtlety can for the most part be attributed to the use of styled and posed full-colour portrait photographs, some of which even appear to have been shot in a professional studio. Compared to the overwhelming sense of ordinariness that one gains from the unposed and candid paparazzi photographs that were employed as evidence for the *Celebrity Proper*, the sense of ordinariness in the *NOBODY'S PERFECT* article relies more on the textual description than on the supposed photographic evidence, which has clearly been ameliorated by professional beauticians and photographers. Compared to the ordinariness that underlies the *Celebrity Proper* figure, the *Emerging Celebrity* in *People* SA presents us with a much more obscure and rudimentary version.

The packaging of misbehaviour

Visual evidence of what is represented as physical imperfection, and also misbehaviour, is not the only thing distinguishing the two Celebrity categories. There is also a marked difference in the way magazines around the turn of the century presented questionable behaviour as part of the Celebrity package. The purported misbehaviour itself remained roughly the same, namely "excessive conspicuous consumption, exhibitionist libidinous gratification, drug abuse, alcohol addiction, violence", to quote Rojek's (2001) observation. But the two subcategories concern a subtly different approach to these excesses.

The difference is slight, and I could only see it in retrospect, in comparison to the evidence for the emergence of the *Celebrity Proper*. In the representation of the later figure, typical of Celebrity magazines of the early 21st century, misbehaviour is typically contextualised, often through speculative psychological analysis. Arguably lending the coverage a sympathetic and perhaps less judgmental overtone, this approach could be said to be aimed at a possible identification with the entertainment personality that is again indicative of the "extended-family repertoire" that Hermes (1995) identified amongst readers of these magazines. Compared to *Celebrity Proper*, the kind of approach taken to misbehaviour in the coverage surfacing the *Emerging Celebrity* is much more synoptic, perhaps reminiscent of an irregular 'catch-up' with a distant relative who gives an overview of what has transpired in the past year. Without the very detailed information about the latest piece of mischief at their disposal, a benefit of the dedicated so called showbusiness-news agencies of the new millennium, the magazines of the late 20th century rather give a broad-strokes outline, with little of the suspense that is characteristic of coverage of the 21st century. Unlike 21st-century Celebrity-magazine coverage, there is hardly any reference to individual Celebrity story arcs that have been traced over recent issues, and the issues' lower frequency compared to new-millennium titles is of course a handicap in this regard. So sometimes there are incoherent, even seemingly haphazard individual story arcs that emerge over a relatively short period of time, such as with TV actor John Ritter, who is portrayed as happily married by *People* in January 1989[92] and quite the opposite in a March/April issue that year,[93] without much warning or any reference to the earlier article.

Both these stories mention the name of Hooperman, the character John played in the eponymous series, and it is interesting to see how there is even what seems to be a deliberate blurring between the private and public personality in the later headline; it is John going through divorce, yet the headline claims that it is Hooperman's marriage that is disintegrating. We also saw other evidence of this trend on the cover of the launch issue.[94] Specifically, the cover mentioned Higgins, the character from the television series *Magnum P.I.*, instead of the actor, John Hillerman. In this same cover line, the "'*Murder She Wrote*' *sleuth*" appears, without the name of the character or actor (Angela Lansbury played the role of Jessica Fletcher). It appears as if this treatment is specifically extended to television

[92] "*WHY JOHN RITTER GAVE UP LIFE IN THE FAST LANE: HOOPERMAN STAR LOVES HIS FAMILY*", *People*, 11–24 January 1989.
[93] "*THE END OF A FAIRY-TALE: HOOPERMAN'S 11-YEAR MARRIAGE CRUMBLING*", *People*, 29 March–11 April 1989.
[94] *People*, 27 May 1987.

personalities, and not as much to film performers or musicians, and it is also an approach specific to television actors that would continue into the new millennium. This trend in *People* SA seems to provide evidence for the argument that television personalities generally simply perform as themselves, as Graeme Turner (2004: 11) argues, "the more seamlessly, the better". If one follows this argument, notions of ordinariness and authenticity emerge in the way the personalities are covered, even if only suggestively.

It is suggested above that the addition of television personalities to the group of people being covered in magazines brought about a de-glamorisation and ordinariness, factors that could be seen as by-products of the international trend in Celebrity journalism towards the end of the 20th century of emphasising the idea of imperfection and misbehaviour. Yet Deborah Jermyn (2006: 81) points out that, "for non US [television] audiences, the programmes' geographical distance feeds in to a sense of their stars being less immediately ordinary and familiar, and perhaps more particularly 'desirable'".

This is an interesting observation to consider for the South African context, as 'desirability' is hardly the term one would use to describe the main sentiment underlying coverage of television personalities (and other performers) in *People* SA. Quite the contrary, in fact. But despite the stories about their relationships failing and their behaviour not always being 'acceptable', the mere fact that the US personalities were physically far away from and beyond the reach of the South African readers of *People* perhaps contributed to their desirability.

This desirability could also be seen as contributing to the extraordinary, which needs to be present for a personality to warrant coverage. Moreover, the extraordinariness should not be overshadowed by the ordinary; there should always be a balance between the two. The idea that the ordinary might dominate the extraordinary in the figure of the television personality, consequently diminishing their desirability and readers' interest in them, might be a way to explain the preference for international actors with their distance-induced desirability, and the simultaneous absence generally of local television performers in the *People* SA coverage.

As the details coming from the sources in Hollywood were no doubt scant and erratic at the time, timelines in articles were generally kept vague and did not specify details, as is clear

from the article "*CHILD STAR DREW BARRYMORE TREATED FOR DRUG ADDICTION*".[95] The article notes that the thirteen-year-old actor "*has been admitted for treatment in a drug clinic*" and "*is undergoing a month's intensive treatment for her drug problems at special centre in Los Angeles, USA*", but there are no specifics about when she was admitted or when she was expected to leave; the absence of suspense here is palpable. Like the majority of the personalities covered by *People* SA, the actor is identified in the headline by both her full name (forename and surname) and a short title, "*child star*", which seems to indicate that readers might not be familiar with her yet; as with the Barnard-Setzkorn article cited earlier, the "extended-family repertoire" is yet to emerge. This also seems to be evident from the fact that the article gives a sobering, if somewhat condescending, near-chronological overview of her life since she gained global fame from the lead role in the Steven Spielberg-directed film *ET* at the age of seven:

> *Spielberg described her then as "seven, going on 29". [S]tarted her career in a dog-food commercial when she was 11 months old. […] She took over a disco until 2 am for her 10th birthday party […] By the time she was 12, she had the body of an 18-year-old […] At 13 she […] developed such a crush on Moonlighting star Bruce Willis that she had to be barred from the studios after she kept pestering him during filming…*

The rumours about the teenage Drew's apparently inappropriate 'adult' behaviour in this excerpt are further supported by her first-person admissions and denials. It has been argued that coverage surfacing Celebrity seems to distinguish itself from magazine representations of the *Star* because it relies not only on gossip and rumour but also on confession, in first-person accounts, which, with its strong religious connotation to sin, would of course necessarily suggest the notion of transgression, especially so-called sins of the flesh. Momin Rahman (2008) argues that confession testifies "to the voyeuristic and scandalous impulses of celebrity culture" and "provides a specific format in which scandal or criticism is replayed, confronted, managed […] providing a dramatic component to celebrity culture" (Rahman 2008: 134).

I would rather relegate the first-person account included in this article, of Drew's childhood being *"anything but normal*" and also her "*favourite fantasy*" of her and a friend getting their driver's licences and "*jumping into a 450 SL Mercedes with a pink interior and a black exterior. We'll cruise the Boulevard and pick up two cute guys. Later we'll get rid of them and pick up two more. In the afternoon we'll get a massage and a facial and make-up*" to the

[95] "*CHILD STAR DREW BARRYMORE TREATED FOR DRUG ADDICTION*", *People*, 25 January–7 February 1989.

realm of admission, although the elaborate and lavish fantasy does succeed in injecting a sense of the extraordinary into the coverage. However, the intimate and invasive question about whether she is still a virgin and her evasive answer has a definite sense of the confessional about it:

> "*I am just a 13-year-old girl who happens to work in the movies. That gives you insight to pose for the camera and give off any image you care to project. How much is the real me and how much is role-playing is my secret*".

As the Celebrity industry becomes more nuanced towards the beginning of the new millennium, confession would come to be used much more strategically by the *Celebrity Proper*, as there appears to be more control over their release, especially with regards to exclusive rights for specific publications or television shows, which implies using them strategically to serve rather than detract from the image of the entertainment personality. Television talk-show host Oprah Winfrey, for instance, would become one of the favoured confessors of many entertainment personalities in the 21st century. On television, as well as in the printed media and especially the weekly magazines, these confessions would often come to be supplemented by more extensive contextualisation of the troubled entertainment-personality soul, through psychological analysis on the part of the talk-show host or magazine staff.

3.2 Barbra Streisand does *Emerging Celebrity*

A sense of confession and a glimpse into the inner emotional life are amongst the reasons an article on Hollywood actor and singer Barbra Streisand in *People* SA of 1989 is a good example of coverage surfacing the *Emerging Celebrity*.[96]

The article, which could be said to be a typical example of *People* SA's coverage of entertainment personalities at the time, was prominently placed (on page two) in the magazine and linked to the main cover image and cover line.

The page allocation inside the magazine is one single page, and there is no explicit time-bound element or 'news hook' given to explain the story's publication at this point. Consequently, the article takes somewhat of a 'life-story' approach, giving details of Streisand's childhood, as well as more recent information. *People* SA still includes these life stories of individual entertainers in its editorial mix, but allocates much less space, page-

[96] "*Poor-little-rich-girl Barbra Streisand is still insecure*", *People*, 11–24 January 1989.

wise, than magazines earlier in the century, and takes a different approach, in that it focuses on the 'highlights' of the personality's life but also on their continuous fallibilities, doubts and anxieties. Describing Barbra as "*the world's most bankable actress*", at an estimated net-worth of R170 million at the time, the article, for instance, points out how the Hollywood fairy tale eludes her, maintaining that, "*[S]he's still as insecure as when she was growing up in the harsh environment of Brooklyn, New York, USA, clinging to a hot-water-bottle cover, her only toy, for comfort*".

It could be argued that the magazine deliberately used the (possible) vulnerability and anxiety she apparently displayed in her private life to contradict or resist what Dyer (1979: 111–113) calls her "on-screen social typification", which she likely acquired by characteristically being cast as a strong and independent female character. As June Sochen (1998: 78) argues, Streisand's film roles "all qualify as thoughtful efforts to portray women as intellectually formidable, interested and engaged in their society". Local film audiences and entertainment magazine readers would for instance have seen her in the leading role in the 1983 film *Yentl*, in which she plays a Jewish girl who assumes a male identity in order to acquire the Jewish Talmudic education reserved for males. Not only does she play a feisty, precocious character in the film, but she also directed, co-wrote and co-produced *Yentl* at a time when the Hollywood film production industry was still very much male dominated. *Yentl* was nominated for a number of awards, and Streisand won the 1984 Golden Globe for film direction, the first woman to receive this accolade in the then forty-year-old existence of the Hollywood Foreign Press Association's annual awards ceremony.[97]

As a woman pioneer in the film-production industry and independently minded screen heroine, Barbra's public image is apparently one of "*ferocity*", the magazine argues, yet it emphasises her contradictory private life: *"Oddly",* the article argues, *"the actress who has a public reputation for ferocity is seldom difficult, obstructive or temperamental in private. She is anxious, guilt-driven and fearful of being seen as vulnerable, especially to men."* She also acknowledges that *"she's still driven by self-doubt"* despite her self-confessed *"big ego"*. Between this confession about being internally conflicted and the third-person observation about her personality in private, we see evidence of the exploration of the emotional or inner life, a characteristic that distinguishes Celebrity coverage from that surfacing the *Star*.

The apparent psychological observations apply to her personality generally and bring a sense of the 'life story' to this article. This is important, as psychologisation becomes more

[97] By 2018, she was still the only woman to have won this award.

pervasive as we move into the 21st century. This is perhaps because going forward, we will see how the (often amateur) analysis and observation in the coverage is applied not as much to the general temperament and character of the personality, and thus to their life story, but more often to a specific incident or series of incidents of questionable behaviour. In this way, the delving into the psyche will start taking place around story arcs rather than around the general life story of the personality, which ensures a steady stream of material or episodes for weekly magazine-publishing.

Instead of idealising her high-profile relationships with other entertainers, the *People* SA article deliberately emphasises their flawed, problematic nature. By the time the article appeared, she was already a divorcée, as she had been married to actor Elliott Gould from 1963 to 1971, and remained the primary parent for their son, Jason Gould. Not only does the article discuss her divorce from Elliott, but it also mentions that, "*[s]he's dated a long line of celebrities, including hairstylist John Peters, former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and ice cream mogul Richard Baskin*." Her relationship with fellow actor Don Johnson, whom South African readers certainly would have recognised from the television series *Miami Vice*, "*had more ups and downs than a roller coaster and in the end they collapsed in acrimony*". Streisand speculates that her dismal romantic life is the result of her lovers feeling "*intimidated*" by her. "*I probably scared the hell out of them*", she exclaims, "*So I lost myself in my work, always thinking that the next time there would be a guy who wouldn't turn tail and run*".

Besides exposing loneliness and heartache, the article also in a certain way appears subtly to pierce the image of the *Star* that had been so carefully produced by the Hollywood film industry over much of the 20th century, which was one involving perfect and glamorous private lives. It undoubtedly retains an element of the extraordinary and the glamorous on the one hand by mentioning Barbra's immense wealth. It for instance notes that the "*ranch-style house on the beach in Malibu*", where she was interviewed, is but "*one of seven homes she has in California, USA*" and that the "*house has a rich collection of paintings and antiques. She admits a flock of dealers comb the auction houses of the world seeking new treasures for her*". The article also notes that by her own admission, "*[S]he earns R2 200 an hour – every hour of the day of every week of every year*."

Yet there is arguably also a hint of the less glamorous, or at least the more ordinary and domesticated, in the article's observation that she actually cooks for herself. Not only does Barbra mention her own cooking to the author of the *People* article, she reportedly actually

demonstrates it, by whisking eggs for an omelette while being interviewed. Note how the much-discussed ordinary-extraordinary divide surfaces here; she might be extraordinary given the fact that she owns multiple homes in California alone, has a "*flock of [arts and antiques] dealers*" at her beck and call and earns a fortune, yet she is also quite ordinary, as she does not appear to have a large domestic team with a cook preparing meals for her; she takes care of this herself. The fact that there is an eyewitness account involved in this article could be read as an attempt at making an ever more compelling case for what Christine Geraghty (2000: 184) has described as the "surprisingly ordinary domestic life" of the *Star*.

A somewhat "watered-down" legacy of the New Journalism movement of the 1960s and 1970s, as Gerald Russello (2005) argues, the late 20th-century entertainment personality profile's trend of weaving first-hand observations made during the interviewing process into the final article is important. Not only does it contribute to the notion of accessibility to the entertainment personality, which can be seen to contribute to the idea of their ordinariness, but it is also significant as it foregrounds a key element of the next representation of fame identified in this thesis, of *showing* the "surprisingly ordinary domestic" (Geraghty 2000: 184) life of the star by providing photographic evidence. Thus whereas *Emerging Celebrity* coverage relies upon the writer's eyewitness accounts of the personalities engaged in their ordinary everyday activities, *Celebrity Proper* coverage, as the next chapter will show, will come to rely on photographic evidence of it. In a certain way, *Emerging Celebrity* coverage finally allows the reader to become a kind of eyewitness to the Celebrity phenomenon.

Another trend that appears to emerge in this *People* SA profile piece, that of interviewing the entertainment personality in the private space of their home, is also significant, as it can be said to symbolise the continuing collapse of the boundaries between the public and private that characterises the trajectory of 20th-century fame. Compared to early 20th-century magazine coverage, where very little or no mention was made of private life, depictions of the private life of the *Star* permeated magazine coverage of the mid-20th century. Later in the century, this penetration of the private realm was taken one step further as the home, that inner sanctum, was penetrated and subsequently incorporated into the coverage and the entertainer image, as this *People* SA article so subtly does. If the home is viewed as symbolic of the *Star*'s private life, it is significant to note in this instance that in the hierarchy of rooms contained within the confines of the walls of a home, the kitchen is usually construed as more private than reception areas such as living room, lounge, dining and drawing room. The only two rooms more private than the kitchen,

arguably, are the bedroom and the bathroom. Thus, the fact that at least a section of the interview is said to take place in the kitchen can be read as an indication that her private life has been at least moderately exposed, not as exposed as it would have been had the ultimately private spaces of bedroom or bathroom been infiltrated, yet considerably more exposed than if the interview had taken place in a reception area of her Malibu beach house.

The eyewitness account of Barbra's omelette preparation leads into a brief exchange that reveals her reasons for cooking for herself: "*When I'm nervous, I need to eat*", she is quoted as saying. "*I used to have a cook, but she was always piling my plate even when I wasn't nervous. Cooking for myself is one way to avoid gaining weight*." Her admission that her weight and by extension her physical appearance is not quite perfect is interesting, as it seems to signal a move away from a dominant perception in *Star* coverage; the perception, as Liesbet van Zoonen and Emily Harmer (2011: 94) have pointed out, that entertainers, especially women, are endowed with "beauty, enigmatic appeal and corporeal perfection". This confession can also be interpreted as an indication that the entertainer is ordinary and 'just like' the reader in terms of having to be vigilant not to gain weight. This comment could simultaneously be read as a subtle indication of a self that is vulnerable to stress and a body that is less than perfect, a body that, it seems, is interpreted as somewhat problematic or flawed.

Conclusion

As entertainers started dominating weekly consumer-magazine coverage towards the end of the 20th century, the heroic element that had been so pervasive in coverage of individuals in early 20th century magazines dwindled. Furthermore, as the coverage from *People* SA magazine seems to show, coverage of these entertainers further eroded the divide between their public and often choreographed and produced private lives. This erosion was achieved by a deliberate dismantling of the neat, sanitised private existence portrayed under the so-called Hollywood marketing machine before its final disbandment in the latter half of the 20th century. Exposure of the shortcomings, flaws, errors, misjudgements and transgressions in the private lives of these entertainers, often through their own admission, in confessions that were subsequently disclosed to the press, with or without their knowledge and permission, was the main way in which the magazines went about their task of taking apart the *Star* image the Hollywood publicity mechanism had so carefully crafted

for its performers. It was a mechanism that was also appropriated by other entertainers and personalities bent on a life in the public eye.

It has been proposed that a significant distinction could be drawn between how weekly magazines portrayed well-knownness in the mid-20th century and how this came to be done towards the end of the millennium, and that this distinction merits a separate categorisation. Even though the terms 'star' and 'celebrity' are used interchangeably in both popular and academic literature, the term *Star* is used here to signal the figure conceived by Hollywood and the term *Celebrity* for the *Star* image tinged by imperfection, flaw and also a sense of misbehaviour.

This is an understanding of well-knownness that became dominant in popular magazines from the end of the twentieth century onwards. In South Africa, the magazine titles that surfaced this understanding as the new millennium approached included *People* but also, even if more subtly, the weekly family titles *Drum* and *Huisgenoot*, which became stable-mates in the early 1980s,[98] and also *Personality* magazine. Yet it is arguably the local edition of the British Celebrity weekly *heat* that seemed to radicalise the notion of Celebrity on the South African media landscape. Consequently, using coverage from *heat*, the more radical *Celebrity Proper* figure will be explored in the following chapter.

This chapter had conjured up the image of descent or fall, from the heavens to the earth, from *Stars* to *People*, so as to open the discussion of an understanding of fame based on the notion of imperfection and misbehaviour. The emphasis in the coverage is on entertainers showing imperfections and being badly behaved and generally troubled. This departs from contemplation, in typical coverage earlier in the century, of the glamour, success and otherwise alluring elements of figure exported through the Hollywood fanzine stardom blueprint of the early 20th century. But something of the glamour of old Hollywood is regained *in spite of* the continued presence of imperfection and misbehaviour in the representation of *Celebrity Proper*. At least one reading of the word 'hot', implied in the title of the magazine *heat*, suggests appeal or cachet, and an understanding of fame that appeared to be based largely on the enticing appeal of flaw will be explored in the next chapter.

[98] *Nasionale Pers*, the founding company of *Huisgenoot*, acquired *Drum* magazine from its founder, Jim Bailey, in 1984.

Chapter 4:
Celebrity Proper: *heat SA* in the early 21st century

The emergence of the notion of 'imperfection' of many kinds in magazine coverage of entertainment personalities around the turn of the 20th century has been noted in the literature. Here it is argued that this growing focus in entertainment journalism can be taken further, and that one could identify two different kinds of figures surfacing from coverage predominantly preoccupied with what could broadly be described as flaws or problematic behaviour.

In coverage surfacing the *Emerging Celebrity*, imperfection and fallibility are referenced with errors of judgement and misbehaviour in the private life and even the first tentative mentions of what are portrayed as physical flaws. What we see in the coverage of the private life of the *Emerging Celebrity* is, in many ways, the opposite of what we see in that of the *Star*: fairy-tale romances and happy families represented as essentially ideal and 'perfect' make way for stories of everything but, namely heartache, loneliness, divorce and single parenthood. This emphasis on imperfection in its various guises seems to be further elaborated, refined and amplified going into the 21st century. Hence the classification of the transitional figure dominating late 20th-century coverage, as an *emerging* one, as elements characterising this figure appear to become more *radicalised* in the first decade of the new millennium. This was one of the major reasons influencing the decision to distinguish between what is called *Emerging Celebrity* and its successor, *Celebrity Proper*. Although, with the predominant focus in the coverage on problematic and even sometimes downright risqué behaviour, it was tempting to call this figure the *Celebrity Improper*.

The radicalisation is achieved in part by a shift to a largely visual approach to providing evidence of imperfection and misbehaviour in *Celebrity Proper* coverage. The visual evidence referred to here is for the most part candid and apparently unauthorised paparazzi photography of personalities seemingly going about their private lives. This group of photographers are among those that, as Redmond (2006: 33) argues, "function to show us the star, celebrity or personality as blotchy, spotty, over/underweight, drunk and disorderly, dishevelled, drugged, angry, violent, deceiving, hiding, lying, stealing, naked, knickerless, bra-less, lewd, promiscuous, or metaphysically 'lost'".

This description, which to some extent resembles adolescent mischief, is important, as it summarises the kind of behaviour that is most often included in the coverage. In other

words, it answers one of the guiding questions, namely *how* a personality gets covered, by giving a clear indication of the kind of behaviour that would be exposed in the magazine.

The candid photograph can be said to be a main contributor to the sense of ordinariness and truth supposedly surfacing from the coverage. With reference to Allan Sekula's "theory of the higher truth of the stolen image", Adrienne Lai (2006: 219) notes that there is a:

> presumption that candid, unguarded images are more natural, and thus more truthful, reflecting more of the subject's 'inner being' […] This notion of the camera as a tool of penetration and revelation […] is particularly cogent in the celebrity context, where artifice and image dominate.

The idea of these supposedly unposed photographs being reflective of the 'inner being' of the entertainment personality is extended, in *Celebrity Proper* coverage, with a further exploration of the inner life of the entertainer. We saw some initial indications of a move to the interior in *Emerging Celebrity* coverage in terms of evidence of first-person admissions and reflections, often of self-doubt, misgivings and anxiety or what could broadly be called 'being troubled'.

These admissions generally seemed to reveal errors of judgement or of behaviour deemed as inappropriate or unfortunate. And although there was not necessarily the idea of sin in a religious sense, the notion of confession seems to surface in the coverage. Bolstered by the evidence provided by candid paparazzi-style photographs, *Celebrity Proper* coverage appeared more focused on the confessional, which Redmond (2008: 110) defines as "any moment in which a star, celebrity, or fan engages in revelatory acts".

The idea of confession connotes transgression. Confession is also understood to reveal at least something about the inner life of the entertainment personality, or what Jo Littler (2004: 13) calls "emotional interiority". There seem to be even further attempts, in *Celebrity Proper* coverage, to reveal and supposedly understand the inner life of the entertainer. This is done through amateurish psychologisation or analysis of often-photographed behaviour in public.

Typical *Celebrity Proper* coverage avoids career histories and characteristically applies psychological analysis at particular moments to story arcs unfolding over one or more consecutive weeks at a time, with a keen interest in minutiae that is evident also in a specific kind of visual approach to the storytelling. This interest in the small detail is a distinctive characteristic in terms of the trajectory. Until the 21st century, the life story of the famous

figure, which was covered in lengthy, text-heavy accounts and even sometimes serialised and published over several months, had a clear presence. But with the dawn of the new century, no doubt driven by the weekly publication schedule and also the idea of 'breaking' Celebrity news, magazine coverage increasingly became oriented around the small detail and story arc of a particular moment rather than the biographical life story.

To summarise, *Celebrity Proper* coverage is typically high-frequency exposure of entertainment personalities' private lives and specifically what could be portrayed as physical flaws and scandalous behaviour at certain key moments. Photographic 'evidence' and a sustained psychological-analysis-style narrative support this. With its keen preoccupation with imperfection and misbehaviour, this kind of editorial approach certainly ran the risk of giving way to coverage that would be unappealing to its intended readership.

Yet, despite the potential for losing reader interest, the *Celebrity Proper* figure would remain a compelling one, at least for a while. This is perhaps because, at least in *heat*, this threat of a much-too 'ordinary', bleak and even tragic figure was successfully countered or tempered by, in the first instance, careful selection of personalities to be included in the coverage to exude some glamour, gloss and appeal. This was to deliberately bring about a countervailing sense of the extraordinary. So even though the focus of the coverage was on scandalous behaviour, there was enough balancing allure in the selection of figures to appear in the magazine. In addition, the magazine took an ironic, satirical editorial approach to coverage.

heat is arguably one of the pioneers of this early 21st-century representation of fame, hence the selection of this title to explore the *Celebrity Proper* category. This juxtaposition between the 'appalling and the appealing' is evident in the comments from Mark Frith (2008), one of the early editors of the original (British) edition of *heat*, in his memoirs, that gossip, glamour and fashion were, for instance, the three elements that made David and Victoria Beckham the perfect couple to feature for *heat* UK. Feasy also describes *heat* as simultaneously "nosy", connoting 'exposé' and thus transgression, and "cool and glamorous" (Feasy, 2008: 688). In addition, Sarah Jane Baker (2006: 8) writes that *heat* UK was targeted at those interested in fashion as well as "celebrity gossip and scandal".

heat South Africa, which was established in May 2004, five years after the original edition had been launched in the UK, remained true to this editorial formula of exposing entertainment-personality scandal while simultaneously showcasing the cool and the glamorous side of fame.

As with the *Emerging Celebrity*, the reasons for the *Celebrity Proper* dominating the local weekly magazine landscape are less evident than they were for the *Star* dominating 1950s *Drum* and the *Epic Hero* being dominant in early 20th century *Huisgenoot*.

The readers' interest could be said to be in misbehaviour in the sense of pleasures of the flesh, or, to be more explicit, sex scandals, with the term 'heat' of course also having that connotation. The local interest in sex scandals is perhaps not so surprising given the swift and sudden change in terms of sexual freedom following the dawn of democracy in South Africa in 1994. Deborah Posel (2005: 129) explains how before democracy, "stringent censorship and a regime of moral prohibition were seen as critical weapons in efforts to […] preserve the rigours of a 'civilized' way of life", yet afterwards, "[T]here has been a veritable explosion of sexual imagery, display and debate" and that, "Issues of sexuality have an extraordinary prominence". She also writes of how after 1994 there was "an abundant circulation of movies, magazines, and pornography, previously considered taboo" (Posel 2005: 130).

In a new and radically changed environment in which, *heat* SA capitalised on its status as the only weekly magazine that was not branded and marketed as a family title to focus mainly on sex scandals. All *heat*'s local competitors were either family titles or had a religious ethos, and this probably had to be fairly discerning about the nature of their showbusiness content and steer clear of especially visually explicit material. These competitors included *Huisgenoot* and *YOU*, its English equivalent; *People*, its Afrikaans equivalent, *Mense*; *Drum*; and *Move!*, a weekly magazine aimed at an aspiring middle-class black women readership, which was launched in 2005.

Although *heat* SA emulated *heat* UK in its publicisation of sexual mischief and other scandalous behaviour that showbusiness personalities got up to in their private lives, it is interesting to note that the two editions differed in terms of the specific personalities represented. In other words, there is a divergence in terms of *who* was covered. Who is deemed worthy of coverage or who merits coverage has been a guiding question in this thesis. Coverage in both editions was primarily of showbusiness and, to a lesser extent, of sports personalities, so it could be said that the same types of people were covered in both *heat* UK and *heat* SA. However, if one looks more closely at where or in which medium these entertainers achieved fame in their public lives, there are differences between the local and the original brand.

In particular, on the back of what Turner (2010) calls the "demotic turn", referring to the greater presence of 'ordinary' or real people, in the media and elsewhere, the original edition of *heat* has always featured a strong contingent of reality-television performers. Holmes (2005: 23) notes that, with specific reference to *heat* UK, these magazines "have developed a symbiotic relationship with the celebrity culture of Reality TV",[99] particularly because they could ensure sustained coverage, at least for a little while, of the notoriously ephemeral fame of the reality-television personality.

Despite reality television already having a relatively strong presence in the country by the time *heat* SA launched and potentially contributing a large number of performers who could be covered in the magazine,[100] *heat* SA, as well as its local competitors, offered them scant coverage. On the advice of *heat* UK following *their* success with reality-television personalities, some of the very early issues of *heat* SA did include fairly regular coverage of these personalities, but *heat* SA launch editor Melinda Shaw explains the early indications were that coverage of these people did not resonate as well with the local readership as it did with *heat* UK's audience. Stories of their lives beyond the reality shows subsequently only appeared sporadically. "We did offer reality television as one of the original motivations for launching *heat* SA", Shaw explained during a personal conversation on 21 January 2014. "But when it came to it, we didn't really have enough reality TV at the time, at least not of the calibre they had in the UK. The local production budgets were comparatively smaller for these reality television shows, which meant they were perhaps less sophisticated than their international counterparts. And also, no reality series, not even the international ones, really got the whole nation talking".

The dearth of local personalities went beyond reality television, however. Generally, *heat* SA covered a higher percentage of international than local entertainers, especially with regards to exposure of controversial behaviour that could potentially be portrayed as scandalous. In this regard it is perhaps interesting to consider the cover of the launch issue of *heat* SA,[101] which featured South Africa-born, but Hollywood-based actor Charlize Theron. The story promoted on the cover with, "*Charlize! Why the East Rand angel was destined to be a star!*"

[99] Holmes (2005: 31) argues that this is in part because in the world of reality television, "the basis of the celebrity as 'ordinary person' clearly has a particular currency", especially for magazines such as *heat* UK and its peers, consumed with the task of simultaneously articulating ordinary and extraordinary elements in their representation of entertainers.
[100] The first season of the local edition of the international *Big Brother* made its debut in 2001, and the first season of *Idols South Africa* debuted in 2002. International reality-television series such as *Survivor* were also broadcast on local television by the time *heat* SA launched.
[101] *heat*, 6–12 March 2004.

leans more in the direction of Charlize's public life and especially her winning an Academy Award (Oscar) the previous year. Yet this was one of the rare exceptions to an editorial tradition generally focused on private-life scandal, especially prominently upfront on the cover of the magazine, and also story arcs rather than life stories encompassing several years and entire careers. Although this treatment of Charlize in the launch issue did not set a precedent for the magazine's approach to international entertainers generally, it could be said to have set the direction for the treatment of locals. Not only was there much less coverage generally, in *heat* SA, of individuals from the local showbusiness community compared to their international counterparts, but the focus of the relatively occasional local story also largely avoided controversy, scandal and the inner life of those it covered.

The readership of *heat* SA also seemed to indicate that when it came to local personalities, they preferred coverage of the kind that could be categorised as surfacing more of the *Star* or Hero than the Celebrity figure. This preference could be read in the way South Africans, compared to the readership of *heat* UK, responded to the regular "*Spotted*" slot on the letters page. Readers were asked to send in their own pictures taken of famous people 'spotted' in public, and the best image of the week would be published and the photographer given a prize. While *heat* UK's readership generally sent in what looked like candid, paparazzi-type images, *heat* SA's readers sent in posed photographs, mostly with the reader in the picture alongside the famous personality. This adulation would be reserved for a Hero or a *Star* figure, one that is held in high esteem, and certainly not a Celebrity figure that is given publicity because of his or her transgressions.

This trend might be attributed to the general absence of a local paparazzi industry, with 21st-century Celebrity magazines strongly relying on paparazzi photography to provide visual evidence of scandalous behaviour and, subsequently, editorial content. A relatively 'young' local entertainment, and especially film,[102] industry could also be said to have played a part, with local actors, musicians and sportspeople being generally guarded or hesitant to expose their private lives and especially potentially controversial aspects.

One is tempted to attribute this state of affairs mainly to the fact that South Africa was a developing country with an extremely conservative recent history, but then it is interesting to consider that, as Gandhy and Thomas (1991) argue, in India, also a developing country

[102] Specific reference is made to film, as how performers from this genre are treated in weekly magazines tends to set the trend for other entertainers as well. This is of course a result of film being the industry that originally established the Hollywood marketing machine, from which, it has been argued, the notion of Celebrity developed.

with a predominantly religious and therefore arguably conservative population, there is a thriving local Bollywood equivalent of Hollywood's marketing efforts, complete with exposure, in gossip magazines and elsewhere, of private-life scandals. These scandals encompass "behaviours that are decidedly subversive of the strict social mores of Indian society and would be considered 'scandalous' […] even by many of their most dedicated fans", note Gandhy and Thomas (1991: 109).

It has been argued that compared to other entertainers, film actors seem to naturally have a sense of the extraordinary about them, especially in developing countries. Gandhy and Thomas (1991: 107–108), for instance, argue that the Bollywood actors are valued in India because, "they offer audiences whose lives are limited in various ways – materially and emotionally – the vicarious pleasures of identification with and exploration of the realm of the extraordinary".

Although the South African film industry is one of the oldest in the world, as Martin Botha (2012) notes, and has been well documented in a selection of important texts,[103] its marketing efforts have always been relatively small compared to those of India and other developing countries. The potential for gaining a necessary sense of the extraordinary in marketing the private lives of performers was arguably limited in terms of SA film actors. By extension, if there was little possibility that local film actors would contribute a sense of the extraordinary, there was also a risk that representation of other personalities would engender too much of a sense of the ordinary without the extraordinary to maintain the balance.

Consequently, compared to the British original, *heat* SA did not cover near as many local performers. However, in most other ways, the local edition of *heat* followed the original quite closely in terms of content and editorial approach and style. This is interesting, especially since, as Littler (2011: 1) argues, there often seems to be a general trend towards 'glocalisation' and personalities being "consumed differently in different places, their meanings shifting alongside their geographical context". As an official international edition, in fact the only one, of the British original, *heat* SA was under somewhat of an obligation to follow a specific editorial formula, yet could, of course, adapt it to suit the local readership.

[103] Thelma Gutsche's 1972 *The History and Social Significance of Motion Pictures in South Africa 1895–1940* is seen as a seminal work about the early years of the South African film industry. Other authors who have documented the industry include André le Roux and Lilla Fourie (1982), Keyan Tomaselli (1989), Botha and Johan Blignault (1992), Botha and Adri van Aswegen (1992), Peter Davis (1996), Jacqueline Maingard (2007), Lucia Saks (2010) and Van Nierop (2016). In addition, there are edited volumes by Isabel Balseiro and Ntongela Masilela (2003), Tomaselli (2006) and Botha (2007).

Perhaps the biggest deviation was the selection of entertainers to feature in the magazine, with, as has been mentioned, relatively limited representation of local performers and a larger selection of international figures known to the local market, which often meant US film performers and musicians rather than the predominantly British contingent of entertainers covered in *heat* UK.

The editorial approach and style of the two editions remained quite similar, however. From the satirical and ironic approach, which could be said to be typical of British humour and also so-called lad-mag culture of the 1990s, to the largely visual representation of imperfection and scandalous behaviour, *heat* SA could be said to have taken its lead from *heat* UK.

4.1 Uncovering the *Celebrity Proper*

It has been argued that the *Emerging Celebrity*, the figure emerging in weekly magazines towards the end of the 20th century, deviated from the *Star*, the image the Hollywood film industry constructed for its leading men and women from the early 20th century onwards.

The literature indicates that this departure from the Hollywood blueprint could be attributed to screen artists becoming "proprietors of their own image" (King, in Gamson 2001: 270) following the disbandment of the Hollywood studio system from the late 1940s onwards. As we have seen, the careful control the Hollywood studios had exerted over the image of their actors was now absent, and weekly magazines no longer belonged to the film studios as they had in the first half of the 20th century. Instead, independent publishers now produced weekly magazines based on the original Hollywood 'fanzine' formula, but with less loyalty to the *Star* image, which meant that there was now scope to interrogate the constructed image of every individual actor.

This interrogation, of course, started taking place gradually from the middle of the 20th century onwards, with magazines appearing to shatter the illusion that entertainment personalities were all leading prosperous, healthy and happy lives. In addition, the kind of figure that emerged from these magazines was often represented as 'only human'; the coverage therefore concentrated on showing that they are not 'perfect' physically and also prone to errors of judgment, missteps and misbehaviour. Classifying this trend as the emergence of fame's "dark side", as Sternheimer (2011: 153) does, is perhaps somewhat exaggerated, yet is nonetheless instructive at this point.

Deliberate exposés of scandalous behaviour by entertainers in their private lives also started appearing. In the South African edition of *People*, the magazine used to examine the notion of *Emerging Celebrity*, this behaviour could be said to be what Rojek (2001) identifies in his exploration of the phenomenon of Celebrity: "excessive conspicuous consumption […] drug abuse, alcohol addiction, violence and so on" (Rojek 2001: 31). *People* published stories of suspected alcohol and narcotics abuse, domestic violence and outrageous and excessive star behaviour that often transgressed "ordinary moral rules" (Rojek 2001: 31).

Celebrities making trouble

Going into the 21st century, representations of fame included evidence of entertainment personalities getting up to all sorts of mischief. In fact, it could be argued that high jinks or misbehaviour was one of the most important distinguishing characteristics of the *Celebrity Proper* category. *heat* indicated the importance of scandal for its editorial vision by placing it most prominently on its cover page for each of its weekly issues, save for a handful every year. (*heat* SA's launch issue and the annual Christmas and New Year's editions also generally tended to favour fame over infamy on the cover.) The most prominent cover position was usually dedicated to an important 'breaking news' story from the week, preferably one that contained some element of scandalous private-life behaviour.

heat was not the first magazine to focus so closely on scandal, as Holmes (2005) points out, making reference to *Confidential*, the US magazine that launched in the 1950s. Right from the outset, *Confidential* was set on exposing Hollywood secrets (Davis 2002; Petersen 2010). This quarterly and later bi-monthly publication indeed appears to be one of the pioneers of scandal, introducing it to the international magazine-publishing industry. It published its stories about "who was having sex with who, who was covering up hidden pasts [and] who was secretly flaunting societal rules", in the process suggesting that "sexual and moral deviance ran rampant in Hollywood" (Petersen 2010). And although it could certainly be argued that it set the trend for the later weekly supermarket tabloids, it does appear to have been a lone, isolated voice during its twenty-seven-year existence. *Confidential* might have "countered the wholesome narratives of traditional, conservative gossip outlets" (Petersen 2010), yet this was a mere foreshadowing of the magazine representations of fame that would appear towards the turn of the 20th century and into the 21st.

Firstly, the coverage of scandalous behaviour in *heat* and its contemporaries was much more visually driven than *Confidential*'s editorial offering. Both Petersen (2010) and Davis (2002) discuss how *Confidential* gathered "surveillance technology" (both audio and visual) largely

as evidence to be used if the magazine had to face legal action (Petersen 2010). By contrast, *heat* used its photographs to prove misbehaviour and physical imperfection to its readers.

Second, the kind of well-knownness that emerged in *heat* and its close competitors was arguably *reliant* on the (admittedly controlled) revelation or exposé of scandalous behaviour and, crucially, also on its *incorporation* into the *Emerging Celebrity* image. This apparent incorporation of controversial behaviour into the entertainer image is one way in which the *Celebrity Proper* sets itself apart from its predecessor.

It is a delicate balance, which appears to hinge on aesthetic appeal. Elizabeth Currid-Halkett (2010) quotes Richard Johnson, editor of the *New York Post*'s gossip column, *Page Six*, in a discussion of why behaving "badly in public" appeared to tarnish socialite and actor Tara Reid's image yet not that of her contemporary Paris Hilton:

> [Reid] also behaved badly in public, but instead of being fascinated by her, the public dismissed her. Johnson has an explanation: Paris behaved badly, but she looked good while doing it. As he explained to me, "Despite her image as a red-carpet-hogging party monster … she is intensely aware that she is being watched and photographed, and she rarely takes a bad picture." Tara, on the other hand, didn't strike Paris Hilton's optimal balance of scandal and glamour; she was pitied, not revered. As Johnson summed it up, "Tara Reid seemed to have a problem at parties, and regularly became, as the Brits say, 'tired and emotional.' She also had a weight problem at one point, and then she had the bad plastic surgery. People just lost interest in her as she continued her descent. And her reality show made matters worse. (Currid-Halkett 2010: 28)

An "optimal balance of scandal and glamour" (Currid-Halkett, 2010: 28) is perhaps a simple way of expressing, at least in part, what the *Celebrity Proper* encompasses and what appears to emerge in *heat* magazine. Holmes (2005: 24) notes that it is problematic to assert that *heat* surfaces a "'new' discursive formation in the construction of celebrity", as *Confidential* had already done this a half-century before. Yet it can certainly be argued that it is not so much the exposure of scandal or wrongdoing that sets *heat* apart from predecessors such as *Confidential*, but the *way* in which this exposure is approached and the kind of understanding of fame that emerges in the process.

So what was *heat*'s idiosyncratic approach to scandal? One of the most important aspects is that it appeared carefully to select the kind of wrongdoing it exposed, the kind of misbehaviour that warranted coverage. Preference was obviously given to behaviour that

could be shown or 'proven' with photographic evidence, as the magazine was more visually than textually oriented.

Moreover, in what can be construed as an attempt to ensure the retention of appeal, the magazine avoided exposing or engaging with serious 'transgression'. Rather, *heat* chose to reveal what could be described as foibles, follies, indiscretions and peccadilloes, many of them related to sex. Typical indiscretions the magazine covered were those associated with "excessive conspicuous consumption", to use Rojek's (2001: 31) phrase.

One example is the exposé of the contents of Paris Hilton's secret locker,[104] with 'caught-red-handed' type of photographic evidence of drug use and sexual behaviour as well as copies of what appear to be letters and personal journals, providing intimate detail about the US socialite and occasional actor's 'bad' behaviour. Words and phrases dotting the copy including "*wild nights out*", "*outrageous*", "*massive pile of cocaine*", "*sex video showing Paris* going at it *with ex-boyfriend Joe Francis*" (emphasis added), and appear to underline the excessive behaviour seemingly legible from the accompanying photographs.

Like many other examples of coverage in *heat* that could be categorised as surfacing the *Celebrity Proper*, the article on Paris's secret locker is firmly rooted in that inner sanctum of private life, the bedroom, and further also appears to expose her 'private parts' (breasts and genitals, or at least as much as the magazine could show without getting into trouble; much of the nudity has been covered and labelled by the magazine as "*too rude*"). This is, of course, interesting from the perspective of the trajectory of fame over the 20th century as a whole. It has been argued here throughout that one could trace a continuous collapse of the boundary between the public and the private in coverage, corresponding with the postmodern trend of what Jean Baudrillard (2007: 58) describes as the "forced extroversion of all interiority" brought about by the "universe of communication" (Baudrillard 2007: 53). Baudrillard refers to television in particular, but his comments could be extended to magazines also as part of the 'communication universe'. In the showbusiness publishing industry, nudity, and specifically nudity in the very private realm of the bedroom, could be said to symbolise the final frontier in the "forced extroversion of [entertainment personality] interiority". Nudity in the private space is also something that could be read as a revelation of the real self, which has been an important element informing representations of fame. Revealing the 'real' is especially important in the representation of entertainment

[104] "*The Smut Insider Paris's Secret Locker!*", *heat*, 10–16 February 2007.

personalities, since their contrasting public lives largely comprise acting/performing, or in other words being someone other than their true self.

Another of the meanings of the term 'heat' is an undesirable amount of attention, as in the phrase 'feeling the heat'. This is palpable in this article, which notes that Paris took action to close down the website that first leaked the contents of her secret locker and was apparently "*incredibly upset and angry*" and felt "*victimised*" by the breach. Yet the magazine also questions why Paris kept "*such damning material in the first place*", in what could be read as a veiled suggestion that it may have been made public deliberately, for publicity purposes. It has been argued before, by Lynn Hirschberg (2009) and Lola Ogunnaike (2006) among others, often with specific reference to Paris's first 'sex tape', salaciously named *1 Night in Paris*, that in the world of showbusiness, sensational visual material, particularly nudity and sex tapes, have been successful marketing tools.

"Ms. Hilton tried to stop distribution of [her first sex] tape, although its notoriety paradoxically catapulted her to an even higher orbit of fame, establishing her as a kind of postmodern celebrity, leading to perfume deals, a memoir and covers of [consumer magazines] *Vanity Fair* and *W*", argues Ogunnaike (2006). *heat*'s implication that the leak might have been part of a deliberate quest for publicity is a prime example of the exposure of the "celebrity-making" mechanism, with Gamson (2001) identifying this kind of exposure as typical of late 20th-century texts.

The apparently deliberate release of intimate private and personal information could be construed as a form of confession. Specifically, the evidence of nudity in Paris' secret locker could be interpreted as such. This observation follows Redmond's (2008) apparent allusion to nudity as confessional, in his reference to a 'naked' photo shoot of US pop singer Britney Spears, published in the magazine *Harper's Bazaar*. "Britney's constructed star or celebrity image is largely built on the carnal confessional mode", Redmond (2008: 150) argues. Confession has been identified as one of the channels through which an element of transgression, specifically of an intimate, sexual nature, surfaced in the media representation of Celebrity from the late 20th century onwards. Previously, in magazine representation that surfaced the *Star*, revelations about private life typically came about through the mechanism of gossip, with close friends, relatives or other confidants 'leaking' or releasing information to the media. But from the turn of the 20th century, first-person confession seems to become common in surfacing the Celebrity figure.

This is interesting, as it could be read as an indication that there is something deliberate, strategic, controlled and measured about the Celebrity confession. In essence, confession is the release, 'first-hand', of private sensitive information that could be potentially damaging to a Celebrity's image. The deliberate and seemingly strategic release of evidence of controversial, possibly scandalous, behaviour in the private realm is a factor distinguishing the *Celebrity Proper* figure from its predecessor, whose private life could be said to be imperfect in some way but who was generally guarded about revealing details and evidence of impropriety, imperfection and the like.

The literature (see, for instance, Redmond, 2008) seems to identify television, not print, as the preferred medium for Celebrity confession, with an "omniscient [television] talkshow host […] blessed with prescience, counselling and therapeutic skills" (Redmond 2008: 150) the confessor of choice. But it can consequently be argued that what appear to be deliberately exposed, measured detail of misbehaviour in private life is print media's answer to the 'first-hand' (and often live) Celebrity confession on a television talk show. Holmes and Redmond (2006) note that:

> celebrity magazines […] would now seem strangely empty without celebrity disclosures ranging across the horrors of plastic surgery, eating disorders, and drug and alcohol abuse, not to mention 'confessions' about depression or infidelity. To observe this is not to trivialize the experience of any of these matters […] but only to point to their increasing conventionalization within the parameters of celebrity discourse. (Holmes & Redmond 2006: 287–290)

Whereas the goal of Celebrity confession via the medium of television appears to be absolution from sin (Redmond 2008), the object of the measured release of details of transgression through the printed medium can be argued to be an enhancement of the *Celebrity Proper* image. Confession is used to "authenticate, validate, humanize, resurrect, extend and enrich" entertainment-personality identities, Redmond (2008: 109) argues. In addition, he writes, by confessing, these personalities "confirm their status as truthful, emotive, experiential beings who – as devotional fans – we can invest in" (Redmond, 2008: 109–110).

While the potential for image enhancement is not always explicitly surfaced in the coverage, it is on occasion made abundantly clear, albeit over a long stretch of time. British model Kate Moss's cocaine habit was, for instance, revealed via unclear still frames extracted from a video seemingly shot clandestinely. *heat* SA published these in an article entitled, "*This could*

cost Kate her career",[105] with no indication in the article that her "*party girl*" behaviour added any allure to her image.

In fact, the Kate Moss article seemed to argue the contrary: that her wild ways were rather unappealing and would cost her dearly in sponsorships and could bring on a potential criminal investigation. However, four years on, "*Cocaine Kate"*, as *heat* nicknamed the model, was seemingly 'absolved' in an article published in 2009.[106] "*It is the Cocaine Kate story all over again*", reads the opening sentence. The article goes on to explain how Kate's *"bad-girl image has always been part of her appeal*" and seems to suggest that it was for this very reason that she had managed to reclaim most of the sponsorship contracts she lost in the wake of the 2005 exposé. In other words, the "*fashion industry by and large forgave*" her.

The term 'forgave', of course, reinforces the idea of confession, although it is hard to imagine that Kate deliberately chose to release the video footage of her alleged drug use, as she must have anticipated the damage it could do. What perhaps emerges in *heat*'s coverage of Kate, over time and through various story arcs, is that the model in essence exuded Currid-Halkett's "optimal balance of scandal and glamour" (Currid-Halkett 2010: 28), that made her a true *Celebrity Proper* figure.

This continuous contrast, or the delicate balance between scandal and glamour, is evident in how *heat* SA marketed itself on its own cover at one stage, as "South Africa's only weekly celebrity glossy". The magazine was known as predominantly focusing on entertainment-personality scandal, yet it was 'glossy' and thus sufficiently glamorous not to risk losing its appeal. Mehita Iqani (2012) writes compellingly about this contrast in the representation of Celebrity in the medium of magazines:

> Celebrity is operationalized through glossiness, both material and symbolic. These many layers of celebrity function through the many elements of the mechanics of gloss […]: their material technologies of glossy paper, colour printing, the complex utilization of smooth shiny textures to communicate value and luxury, the employment of lighting to suggest divinity, and the strategic juxtaposition across magazines of these aestheticized forms with 'real' images which work to reiterate the tangibility and human fallibility of celebrity, thereby making their aestheticized images all the more seductive and appealing. (Iqani, 2012: 99)

[105] De Matos, Lara, "*This could cost Kate her career*", *heat*, 1–7 October 2005.
[106] *"Joost in sex and drugs scandal"*, *heat*, 21–27 February 2009.

She might have briefly lost her seductive powers and appeal, yet *heat* argued that 'Cocaine Kate' regained them over time. In the 2009 article in which the magazine made this claim,[107] Kate is referred to, by way of comparison, in an exposé of a scandalous story arc involving the leaking of a controversial video of Joost van der Westhuizen, a retired local Springbok rugby captain. With this story arc involving the video scandal, Joost is one of the very few local personalities, arguably even the only one, to very briefly surface as a *Celebrity Proper* figure, but for a number of reasons this status could not be sustained over time. The video scandal was "something new for the South African public and something which has not really happened to anyone else since", Antoinette Muller (2017) writes, "[I]t perhaps serves to further underline Van der Westhuizen's "celebrity" status".

One of only a handful of sportspeople and also local personalities to receive relatively frequent coverage in the magazine, Joost was celebrated in *heat* SA mainly for his toned physique, in a feature entitled "*Buffed Up*",[108] for instance, with his naked torso on display relatively often, mainly during rugby training sessions.[109]

He was also of interest as part of a 'showbusiness coupling' by virtue of his marriage to singer and actor Amor Vittone, who appears to encourage the magazine's celebration of her husband's masculinity; "*Sometimes I watch him train*", she is quoted as saying in a 2004 interview, underlining the sex appeal of implied by the magazine's title with the following sentence: "*That's hot*".[110]

For the first few years of *heat*'s existence, Joost and Amor were cast as a local version of David and Victoria Beckham. "*We do coordinate what we wear when we go out so that one of us isn't in jeans and the other in evening wear!*", Vittone is quoted as saying in the interview. *"I love the way the Beckhams look like a styled unit when they go out*". They even imitated the British couple in photographs on more than one occasion, seemingly proving Gamson's (2001) assertion that the "ironic, winking tone" through which fame is communicated that appears in the late 20th century has led to personalities incorporating a kind of irony into their own behaviour and public image.

Yet, unlike that of his self-confessed role-model David Beckham, Joost's image could never quite compellingly accommodate the evidence in the secretly shot "*sex and drugs video*"

---

[107] *Ibid*.
[108] *Buffed Up*, *heat*, 17–23 July 2004
[109] See for example *Week in Pictures* section, *heat*, 31 July–6 August 2004
[110] Adams, Alyn, *"I have a thing for sportsmen… changing rooms smell sexy"*, *heat*, 21–27 August 2004.

that was covered in *heat* and become *Celebrity Proper* over a sustained period of time. Former English football-team captain David successfully managed to incorporate relatively similar indiscretions, namely repeated accusations of infidelity, into his personal image, as it seemed to add to rather than detract from his appeal. The main difference between Joost on the one hand and David Beckham and Kate Moss on the other is that there was a definite loss of allure that came about through the scandal, not least from evidence in the video of his well-worn underwear, which *heat* pointed out with an arrow device superimposed on the still image.

David never denied accusations of infidelity, rather choosing to appear in 'loved-up' photographs with Victoria shortly after allegations arose, keeping his fans guessing and thus adding, perhaps, to his image as a sex symbol. By flatly denying that it was him in the leaked video, Joost, however, precluded himself from adding to his own appeal. But even if he had tried to use the scandal to augment his image as sex symbol, he might not have succeeded, by virtue of the fact that he could never quite counter the element of ordinariness he represented as a local personality with the required level of extraordinariness that Kate and David had as international figures. In other words, in his worn underwear, Joost had too much bleak ordinariness and not enough appealing extraordinariness to remain a true *Celebrity Proper* figure.

Not all of *heat*'s exposés were as serious as those involving Joost and Kate, however. There was, for instance, a much lighter-hearted, dedicated and separate weekly "*Scandal!*" section, which came complete with thick red page-frames and tears, exclamation marks and myriad other visual devices reminiscent of the tabloid tradition. In just one issue,[111] the following 'scandals' were revealed in this section: UK glamour-model Rebecca Loos's admittedly embarrassing, by their very nature but also perhaps for their working-class associations, "*porcine hand-jobs*" for reality television show *The Farm*, Irish rock band U2's car breaking down, US actor Renée Zellweger being issued with a traffic fine, evidence of Australian pop singer Kylie Minogue not taking sufficient care during a beauty routine, and a trio of what were interpreted by the magazine as fashion faux pas committed by singer Mariah Carey and actors Maggie Gyllenhaal and Kate Winslet.

Gamson (2001) argues that one of the important characteristics of late 20th-century magazine coverage is an embedded instruction to readers to not only recognise that the entertainment personalities themselves are "constructs" but also to identify the actual

[111] *heat*, 23–29 October 2004.

construction process in the magazine itself. "The audience has been instructed not simply in viewing the self behind the image (what the star really thinks, wears, does) but in viewing the fabrication process (how the celebrity is being constructed to amuse)", Gamson (2001: 17) writes.

It is surely significant that in *heat*, this instruction appeared to be especially forthcoming in its light-hearted weekly "*Scandal!*" section. See, for instance, how the magazine appeared to show the fame-making machine in action in the Rebecca Loos article.[112] The "*self-confessed Becks-bonker*", referring to Rebecca's widely publicised claims that she had had an affair with David Beckham, would stop at nothing to gain fame, even if it meant participating in the artificial insemination process of a pig: "*It seems there really are no limits to what Rebecca Loos will do to get famous*", the copy reads, going on to argue that "*the limelight-hogging PA jumped at the chance*" to become involved in an animal artificial insemination programme that was screened as part of the UK reality-television show *The Farm*. With considerable amounts of irony, *heat* appeared to alert its readers to the idea that Rebecca continued to build her fame with the latest step being this appearance on television.

In "*Kylie's fake tan stripe*", it is pointed out, not disapprovingly, how entertainment personalities do fake certain things, such as a "*flawless tan*" in the case of Australian pop singer Kylie Minogue, thereby appearing to subtly suggest to its readers that the kind of physical 'flawlessness' associated with figures like Kylie is, in fact, a ruse, and in the process of course alerting them to the construction of the image. Again with generous use of irony, Kylie is reprimanded not for "*faking*" her "*flawless tan*" – in fact, the magazine actually seems to congratulate her for being cautious in the face of "*horror stories about sun-damage*" – but rather for not taking enough care in applying the tan and subsequently displaying "*that glaring white instep*". A "*media pro*" like Kylie should not be making this kind of error, the magazine argues, in another note to its readers that entertainment figures maintain certain constructed appearances for the media in order to create a specific public image.

The fact that these apparent hints at the actual construction process of the public image emerge especially clearly in a regular section devoted to what is portrayed as scandal is arguably an indication of the importance of an element of scandal or misjudgement in the *Celebrity Proper* figure.

[112] Adams, Alyn, "*Rebecca Loos pulls a porker!*", *heat*, 23–29 October 2004, p. 57.

Showing (imperfect) skin

The exposure of less-than-perfect behaviour was complemented by regular photograph-driven features on what *heat* often called 'body flaws'. These include, amongst others, physical imperfections such as skin 'break-outs', visible cellulite and 'bad hair days'. In addition, the magazine seemed to do justice to the idea of law enforcement also encompassed in the term 'heat', by 'policing' Celebrity wardrobe choices and indiscretion in terms of personalities revealing parts of their body that the magazine argued should perhaps have remained hidden because of their dampening effect on visual appeal.

heat magazine was one of the first, if not the first, magazine to include these features revealing or showcasing specific parts of the Celebrity body in its editorial formula. Although the magazine has been criticised, by Baker (2006), amongst others, for the prominence it gives to physical flaws, as it often features these in the most visible position on its cover, a close examination of these editorial features seems to reveal an attempt to use the photographs not so much as proof of 'flaw' but as justification of the argument that the entertainers are 'just like us'. Note for instance the significant use of the word "*equaliser*", apparently in an attempt to create the impression that readers and entertainers share the same burden, in the introductory line of a feature on cellulite, a favoured and often-covered 'physical flaw': *"The A-list may be rolling in dough, but every now and then that great equaliser, cellulite, proves that they're all human after all…*".[113] This introductory line, typical of *heat*'s editorial style, again contains the term 'human', with all its connotations of fallibility and ordinariness that are such crucial elements in the representation surfacing the *Celebrity Proper*.

Whether it be a 'bad hair day', an unfortunate choice of outfit or a questionable boyfriend, a sense of the less than perfect, or the not so ideal, is one of the key focus areas for coverage of the *Celebrity Proper*. And it is a characteristic that again shows up the contrast between the ordinary and the extraordinary in the representation, with physical imperfection in particular often used to justify ordinariness, while a sense of the extraordinary can be said often to permeate coverage of scandalous behaviour.

[113] "*Wobble Attack*", *heat*, 11–17 December 2004, pp. 40–45.

4.2 Producing the *Celebrity Proper*

The way coverage was executed in the weekly magazines changed markedly over the century. In *heat* and other typical 21st-century weekly showbusiness magazines, this execution relied on a combination of elements that revolved around the provision of a specific kind of visual evidence of misbehaviour and what was portrayed as physical imperfection. Notably, photographs are used as evidence to expose transgression and supposed flaw. But it is not only the use of specific photographic imagery that characterises *Celebrity Proper* coverage; it also concerns the way in which this visual evidence is applied in the magazine in general and even seems to influence the copy. The writing is influenced not only by the reliance on visuals, but also by the demand for a delicate balance, in the coverage, between the extraordinary and the ordinary, the glamorous and the scandalous. All of these techniques are unpacked and illustrated here, using *heat* SA as an example. They leave one with a growing sense that more than any other category of fame discussed in this thesis, the *Celebrity Proper* could perhaps be said to have edged towards being *produced* by the magazines rather than merely consumed by them.

The visual supersedes the textual

As a typical weekly Celebrity magazine of the early 21st century, *heat* relied heavily on photographic images to represent the *Celebrity Proper*, with textual representation becoming ever more brief, seemingly in an illustration of the old adage that 'a picture is worth a thousand words'.

There is, for instance, a steep decline between the total word count generally dedicated to the representation of the *Epic Hero* figure that emerged in early 20th-century magazines such as *Huisgenoot* and the average word count afforded a *Celebrity Proper* in *heat*. For instance, a typical hagiographic profile of a politician or church minister in early 20th-century *Huisgenoot* would comprise roughly 2 500 words, with a popular statesman such South African President Paul Kruger being covered in regular profile pieces over the first couple of decades of the magazine's existence. A similar approach was taken in 1950s *Drum*, with a series of lengthy and wordy articles devoted to Dolly Rathebe, amongst other popular local entertainment personalities. Towards the end of the 20th century, serialised coverage was a thing of the past, with *People* devoting between 400 and 800 words per article to its coverage of performers. By comparison, *heat*'s stories were, on average, much shorter, sometimes not even 100 words. In *heat*, only approximately 3 000 words were typically used

to tell the story of an entertainment personality who remained newsworthy over a relatively long period of time. Reference is made to the longevity of the personalities in terms of news value here, as many more personalities are covered in one issue of *heat* compared to one issue of early 20th-century *Huisgenoot*. This implies that the average dedicated word count for a more fleeting kind of personality is even lower.

As word counts declined, the emphasis on the visual increased. For example, each of President Kruger's profile pieces in *Huisgenoot* were generally illustrated by a single, small, black-and-white photographic portrait image only, while a full-page colour photograph accompanied even the most text-heavy features in *heat* magazine (the interviews). In other words, photographs completely dominated other types of editorial material in *heat*, with the weekly "*Week in Pictures*" section typically featuring several pages of photographs (some individual images covering a full two-page spread) with, by comparison, only minimal copy, i.e. approximately 100 words per illustrated story in the section.

With its growing reliance on photographs, and subsequent economic use of words, to convey its message, *heat* was probably one of the most extreme examples of the general late 20th-century trend of steep word-count decline in printed media, with public opinion lamenting the demise of 'long-form' journalism and mourning the so-called 'death of the printed word'.

Used more prominently than in weekly magazines of previous years, photographs in early 21st-century magazines appeared to have to fulfil more functions than mere illustration. Specifically, photos appear to be used to "incriminate" and "justify", to use Sontag's terminology (1990: 5), in her seminal series of essays on photography. *heat* used photographs as evidence of wrongdoing, such as infidelity. "*Brad & Angelina: Proof!*", read the cover line that accompanied the image the magazine used as evidence of Hollywood film actor Brad Pitt's affair with Hollywood film actor Angelina Jolie while he was still married to television actor Jennifer Aniston.[114] The use of illegal substances was also exposed through photographs; the magazine's 1–7 October 2005 cover, for instance, states that Kate Moss was "*caught on camera*" taking cocaine and that in addition to the one on the cover, there are "*shocking*" photographs inside the magazine to provide further evidence.

Crucially, the incrimination was achieved not only through the higher ratio of photographs to copy but also by the choice of the specific *kind* of images, namely unclear, paparazzi-type

[114] *heat*, 7–13 May 2005.

images that may lack sharpness (the 'Cocaine Kate' images are an excellent example). Quoting Sekula, Holmes (2006: 26) reminds that, "the blurred focus and grainy aesthetic of [candid photography] trades not only on an aesthetic of realism but also the belief in 'the higher truth of the stolen image'". Paparazzi images, which are out of focus, badly composed, and, as Becker (in Bull 2010: 174) so descriptively explains, may contain "intrusive foreground objects" and capture "strange facial expressions and poses", are believed to show what the person who is the subject of the photograph "is really like" (Becker, in Bull 2010: 175) and by extension prove their 'authenticity'. As the previous two chapters have attempted to illustrate, 'authenticity' has been a key theme in the construction of entertainer-dominated well-knownness. Whereas a publicised private life appeared to be used to establish authenticity for the kind of entertainer this thesis would classify as a *Star*, an element of wrongdoing, generally represented in copy, did likewise for the *Emerging Celebrity*. In the case of the *Celebrity Proper*, a specific kind of photograph, most often confirming behaviour that could be interpreted as scandalous, appears to be the next step in the authentication process.

Not only images of misbehaviour seem to support the idea of authenticity, however. Photographs of entertainers in everyday situations, with Stephen Bull (2010: 181) identifying some of these as "out shopping, on the beach, in parks and even through windows", that emphasise "the *visibility of celebrities in public spaces*", as Holmes argues (Holmes 2005: 26, original emphasis retained), also seem to further entrench 'authenticity' in the kind of Celebrity figure *heat* magazine represented.

The images that appear to underline this visibility of the entertainer in public were ostensibly generally used to justify a key factor in the representation of *Celebrity Proper*, namely that the entertainers are 'just like us' in that they are 'ordinary' in their behaviour and appearance. But there is also an element of the extraordinary that seems to suggest itself in *heat*'s coverage of personalities in their private capacity out in public. This extraordinariness perhaps arises, in this instance, from the magazine's dedicated focus, on a weekly basis, on a fairly wide range of personalities going about their relatively 'ordinary' private existences in public, specifically in the so-called "*Week in Pictures*" section but also elsewhere. Plus, of course, extraordinariness is assumed in the sections seemingly devoted to ordinariness, even if it the former element is only hinted at or even omitted in the coverage; a random, truly 'ordinary' person without any prior extraordinariness would never be selected for inclusion in the magazine simply for going "out shopping".

Photographs are also used as evidence to contextualise behaviour. In the "*Week in Pictures*" article entitled "*Britney's break-up blues*",[115] large images of pop singer Britney Spears "*dressed in her new and unflattering favourite uniform – trucker chic*" and "*looking rather drawn and haggard*" are used to justify the contention, in the copy, that it is her problematic love life that is to blame for her choice of attire and apparent low mood. But it can also be argued that, in addition, the photographs are implicitly used to advance the 21st-century weekly magazine's continued attempt to expose the supposedly 'ordinary' elements of the personality's private life.

But, importantly, as much as the magazine seemed to use photographs as evidence of ordinariness, it also had an equally visually driven approach to 'proving' extraordinariness, the other side of the comparison that, as has been argued in the literature (see Dyer 1979), has been underlying entertainer-dominated well-knownness since it first appeared in the Hollywood fanzines of the early 20th century.

In *heat*, 'extraordinariness' seems to emerge, at least in part, from photographs showing the kind of lifestyle wealthy entertainment personalities are able to afford and also photographs showing their glamour, typically with a focus on fashion and beauty. Holmes (2005: 34) argues that the extraordinariness *heat* seems to portray appears to be either attached to their "wealth and the lifestyle" or their "special, God-given beauty", especially in the case of women. Holmes (2005) also points out that the element of 'merit', in terms of talent, which, it has been argued, formed an important part of the juxtaposition in the past, appears to be largely missing in *heat*'s reading of well-knownness; this omission could perhaps partially be explained by the challenge in portraying 'merit' in *heat*'s visual approach to storytelling.

Focusing on the details

The kind of well-knownness emerging in *heat* magazine was also influenced by the *way* in which images were used. Specifically, magazines such as *heat* often manipulate images, as Bull (2010: 181) explains, "supplementing the existing effects of the paparazzi picture by the use of cropping, enlargements and colour casts", with arrowed text boxes and "words layered directly onto photographs […] to fix their meaning". In *heat*, this supplementation of fixed meaning directs the reader's focus to specific parts of the picture, very often small detail/s that might otherwise have been missed in the grainy blur typical of paparazzi

[115] *"Britney's break-up blues"*, *heat*, 14–21 May 2004.

images. The treatment of the set of photographs of Britney Spears[116] is a good example, with arrows and text layered onto the images pointing out what the magazine portrays as vices, small ones in this instance: tobacco and unhealthy eating habits.

In fact, visual elements such as arrows and text layered onto images were some of the main devices used by *heat* to portray supposed bodily imperfections or misbehaviour. Circles, arrows and 'sticker-like' elements are used to focus the attention on a variety of body flaws including large hands and what are called out by the magazine as "*terrible teeth*", "*spider toes*", huge foreheads, lopsided lips, monobrows, "*freaky fingers*", "*gnarly knees*", a protruding backside and a so-called "*trophy head*" in a 'main' feature (i.e. the feature that occupies the most prominent position on the magazine's cover that week).[117]

Again, as with the 'cellulite article', the text accompanying the photographs seems to emphasise the 'just like us' or 'ordinary' notion of the figure of the *Established Celebrity*: "*We're all just human, after all, and we all have our imperfections – and these A-list stars are no exception*", reads the introductory text to this feature.

It might be tempting to view the 'devil-is-in-the-detail' approach that is achieved through the addition of elements such as arrows, circles and text layered onto photographs as mere visual embellishment and therefore quite superficial. Yet a more in-depth examination appears to reveal that this visual approach is, in fact, an enactment of the editorial focus of early 21st-century entertainment weeklies: a sharp gaze on the minutiae or the small details of everyday private life. Every action, even the smallest one, seemed to have been observed. Thus, any given week would give an account of where a personality had walked, shopped or gone for a beauty treatment, what they had worn and, most importantly, since showbusiness couplings continue to be some of the most interesting parts of the private-life construction, with whom they had met. If a personality's private life was visible at the time, if they happened to be a 'hot' topic, or newsworthy, weekly magazines created the impression that they were able to give a so-called 'blow by blow' account of their actions.

Perhaps one of the most salient illustrations of this focus on every action is the "*Week in Pictures*" section. Placed prominently upfront in the magazine, with this kind of placement, of course, indicating importance, the "*Week in Pictures*" section provided what appeared to be a kind of visual diary of what had transpired in the 'Celebrity world' construct (often colloquially called Tinseltown by *heat* and its peers) in the previous seven days, each page or

[116] *Ibid*.
[117] "*Celebrity Flaws!*", *heat,* 23–29 October 2004.

double-page spread showing a scenario in which one of a selection of entertainers had found themselves in the past week. Sometimes, the coverage described an isolated scenario or spotting, but oftentimes, there would have been some contextualisation of an individual scenario in terms of the bigger narrative of the entertainer's image at the time. This contextualisation is one of the key characteristics of *Celebrity Proper*. In other words, a personality who is deemed newsworthy at a given point often appeared in successive issues of the magazine, and through the magazine's focus on small changes in behaviour and appearance, the reigning Celebrity narrative unfolded episodically, on a weekly basis, not unlike the individual storylines in a soap opera.[118]

Importantly, it could be argued that, more than ever before, the weekly frequency preferred by Celebrity magazines, framed the kind of episodic, cumulative storytelling involved in representing the *Celebrity Proper*. By comparison, titles such as *People* and *Drum* seemed to take more of a 'monthly-magazine' approach in their coverage of entertainment personalities, reporting in very broad strokes on private and public lives rather than the subtle little shifts and changes happening over a week.

A 2004 appearance of Britney Spears in the "*Week in Pictures*" section[119] is a good illustration of this focus on the minutiae, in terms both of small details indicated on the photographs themselves (again with the aid of visual devices) and also an apparently close examination of the individual events that had transpired in the singer's life during the week.

Britney is one of a group of women considered to be particularly newsworthy or 'hot' by Celebrity magazines in the first decade of the 21st century, as they engaged in highly visible private-life activities, some of which could be classified at the very least as controversial, in some cases even as 'transgressive'. The year 2004 (when *heat* SA launched) was arguably an eventful one for Britney, thanks to a series of highly visible public events that have since been interpreted as signalling the early stages of the kind of publicised downfall characteristic of this select group of women entertainers (Fairclough 2008). Amongst other things, she married childhood friend Jason Alexander and had the marriage dissolved fifty-five hours later. She later had an affair with one of her 'back-up dancers', Kevin Federline,

[118] Others have also surfaced similarities between soap operas and gossip magazines. Hermes (1995) for instance argues that people seem to these magazines and watch soap operas for the same reasons; that the two media hold the same kind of attraction. Quoting Modleski, Hermes (1995: 126) explains how in soap operas and in gossip magazines, "Whatever may happen to the enormous cast […] they tend to come back to the family, the hospital or small village in which the story is set".
[119] "*Britney's break-up blues*", *heat*, 15–21 May 2004.

whom she ended up marrying, and most of the footage for their 2005 reality show, *Britney and Kevin: Chaotic*, was shot during the second half of 2004.

Through its focus on the small details of her behaviour and movements just in the preceding week, the two-page spread in the "*Week in Pictures*" section represented the latest 'episode' in the dominant Britney story arc at the time, with the copy on the spread arguably emphasising the unfolding of events over a matter of a week:

> *Last week, heat exclusively showed pics of Britney out and about with her new man […] But mere days later it emerged that far from being single as he'd pretended to be, the chancer is actually married – with two children! After the news broke, Britters, who was holed up at the Beverly Hills Hotel, was heard slamming doors and screaming on the phone. When she did emerge later that evening, it was to pop into the local convenience store*.[120]

And it is in said convenience store where the set of pictures is taken showing "*Britters*", looking low and "*puffing furiously on a Marlboro light*", that dominate the page on which this tranche of copy appears. The small details in this snapshot account of her week and current story arc manage to surface elements of both the ordinary and the extraordinary within the ordinary. The small details in the Britney account appear to be aimed at showing that she is a girl who does a quick late-night dash to the corner café for comfort (junk food and cigarettes), much like many other young women; this is the element of the ordinary surfacing in the magazine's representation. But there is also something extraordinary about all this apparent ordinariness that is also visible in the small details: she does not attempt the late-night trip from home but from none other than the Beverly Hills Hotel. The copy points this out, as it were, in passing, and there is *nothing* ordinary about this iconic ninety-year-old hotel with its close historic association with Hollywood actors. If one considers that the five-star hotel has round-the-clock room service, and that Britney probably has staff member/s who can undertake the late-night foray on her behalf, a seemingly ordinary action suddenly becomes peculiarly extraordinary.

Thanks to the constant surveillance and documentation of even the smallest detail of the personality's life, the notion of 'Panopticism' does hold some interesting ideas for the study of Celebrity and power. Thompson (1995) has argued that whereas the Panopticon allowed for the surveillance, and subsequent domination, of the many by the few, the development

[120] *Ibid*.

of communication media seems to have facilitated a situation where the few have become visible to the many, but, importantly, the power generally tends to remain with the few:

> Whereas the Panopticon renders many people visible to a few and enables power to be exercised over many by subjecting them to a state of permanent visibility, the development of communication media provides a means by which many people can gather information about a few and, at the same time, a few can appear before many; thanks to the media, it is primarily those who exercise power, rather than those over whom power is exercised, who are subjected to a certain kind of visibility. (Thompson, 1995: 134)

In the Celebrity media, with their reliance on the ever-present throng of paparazzi photographers, this certainly seems to be the case. In addition, it is interesting to note that the audience research that Hermes (1995) conducted revealed that readers report feelings of power, especially when reading about scandal.[121]

The small-detail focus and subsequent episodic unfurling of Celebrity narrative is arguably one of the ways in which the kind of well-knownness *heat* represents can be distinguished from previous incarnations. *heat* SA launch editor Melinda Shaw, in a personal conversation (21 January 2014) refers to the magazine's serialised approach as 'step by step' in a brief comparison between Britney Spears and Amy Winehouse and American film actor Rock Hudson, who is perhaps best known for his leading roles (often opposite actor Doris Day) in several romantic comedies of the 1950s and 1960s:

> Because the information and photographs were so readily available [to *heat* at its time of launch], we could follow someone's breakdown, like that classic Britney Spears breakdown, and also Amy Winehouse, step by step. Compare Amy with Rock Hudson, one of the first famous people to have died of AIDS. You heard he died of AIDS after the fact. You couldn't follow his decline like you did with Amy. She had good days and bad days and days in the middle and extreme days. And everything is captured on film […] and it's available, so now you can sit with this whole case study of photos in front of you if you read the magazine every week. (Melinda Shaw, personal conversation, 21 January 2014)

Very close attention to detail, as symbolised by the use of visual devices layered onto photographs to guide focus, is an important element in the kind of visual style used to

[121] Hermes's (1995) ethnographic study of audience reception of gossip magazines indicated, for instance, that the pleasures of reading gossip magazines include "gaining a sense of secret power" over entertainers, especially when reading about their wrongdoing (Hermes 1995: 126).

construct the *Celebrity Proper*. Yet also evident in some of the features illustrating this point is the way in which the magazine appears to have built the notion by using thematic visual features in which a large number of entertainers appear and that rely on a plethora of images of physical imperfection and/or misbehaviour, such as being drunk in public or behaving outrageously otherwise.

To a lesser extent, one can perhaps also include here the composite illustration accompanying the regular weekly lead story in the "*Fast Gossip*" section; these brief, and often trivial, stories usually appear to be selected for revealing the outrageous, excessive or the extraordinary, which is emphasised by the exaggerated collage-like illustrations. A piece of 'fast gossip' detailing Paris Hilton's acquisition of a spot in a cemetery for her pet goat is a good example.[122] Paris's extreme display of affection for her pet goat is ridiculed in the illustration depicting her against the backdrop of the cemetery and appearing to 'think' about a goat. Through these kind of regular visual features, a veritable gallery of excess, imperfection, gaudiness and public mischief is created that, by virtue of the volume of images used in addition to the way in which they are manipulated, overwhelms and often seems to aim at achieving an overarching impression of the cartoonesque. In a small way, this kind of visual treatment could be said to elicit some sense of the 'carnivalesque' or of the spectacle that Heather Nunn and Anita Biressi (2010) have associated with the tabloid media in general. All of these devices and actions, which appear to be typical of 21st-century Celebrity magazines, also contribute to the surfacing of the 'extraordinary' side of the all-important ordinary-extraordinary paradox.

Writing *Celebrity Proper*

It has been argued that, more than any other form of well-knownness in the 20th century, *Celebrity Proper* relies on visual representation, mostly in the form of paparazzi photographs, and also on a very specific visual style of presentation. But, as Gamson (2001) seems to suggest, the kind of fame most commonly found in magazines of the late 20th century is also negotiated using a specific style of *writing*. As staff members on the magazine, we used to talk about 'heating up' a piece of writing, meaning applying *heat*'s specific editorial voice and style to the text.

As previously suggested, specifically with reference to the "*Scandal!*" section in *heat*, the *Celebrity Proper* is represented with the liberal use of irony. This is perhaps best witnessed in

[122] "*Paris buys celeb plot for a pet!*", *heat*, August 2006.

the so-called 'literal' captions accompanying many of the photographs in *heat*. One example can be found in a "*Week in Pictures*" instalment featuring local entertainment personality couple Zuraida Jardine (radio and television presenter) and Josh Lindbergh (heir of veteran local-entertainment couple Des and Dawn Lindbergh).[123] The text reveals that Josh and 'Zee', as the magazine nicknamed her, were at the local stage production of *The Phantom of the Opera*, and while an accompanying photograph appears to show them reading the programme for the show, the caption states that, "*The hungry diners couldn't read the tiny writing on the menu*". Another photograph shows Josh paying for a box of chocolates, with a handbag also in the picture; the accompanying caption appears to be a direct quotation from him stating that he will pay for the cashier's silence (in relation to the media, it is assumed) about "*his handbag*". The implication of the caption is that heterosexual Josh, arguably a so-called "*metrosexual*" in terms of his obvious concern with his appearance, might be uncomfortable with any suggestion, such as carrying a handbag, that he might be effeminate or homosexual. Of course one can take the interpretation even further by guessing that it is actually Josh's (heterosexual) public image as one half of a high-profile local couple, that might fit uncomfortably with any suggestion of femininity or homosexuality. It stands to argue that these ironic captions, which appeared on almost every feature except the articles in the news, fashion and beauty sections in *heat*, are small reminders to the readers not to accept anything in the magazine, not least of all the personalities themselves, at face value, since there is every likelihood that everything is artifice.

"Through irony", Gamson (2001: 18–19) writes, "these celebrity texts reposition their readers, enlightened about the falseness of celebrity, to 'see the joke' and avoid the disruptive notion that there is nothing behind a fabricated, performed image but layers of other fabricated, performed images".

The constant showing up of artifice can easily translate into a malicious tone, a kind of 'bitchiness' for which Celebrity magazines (and, later, also entertainment-news blogs, see for instance Kirsty Fairclough 2008) are often criticised. Shaw explains how *heat*'s tone was developed in an attempt to consciously avoid any intentional malice. "We wrote with compassion and with a little bit of *schadenfreude* […] but you had to do it in a funny way", she explains (Melinda Shaw, personal conversation, 21 January 2014).

[123] *"Josh and Zee go to the theatre", heat*, 31 July–6 August 2004.

The necessary inclusion of a humorous element is arguably another of the distinguishing features of *heat*, Shaw suggests (*Ibid.*), but also of the *Celebrity Proper*, specifically compared to preceding understandings of fame identified here, which appear to favour relatively 'dry' and 'straight' reportage. "You could stop at any point in the magazine, and there would be something funny", Shaw explains (*ibid*.). "That is what set *heat* apart; it had to be entertaining". In a McLuhanesque way, then, the medium becomes the message in this instance, with the magazines covering entertainment news themselves becoming a form of entertainment.

While this humorous and entertaining approach could be viewed as a way in which potential malice could be avoided, as Gamson (2001) has also noted, it could also be seen as a way in which they attempted to meet what some have argued (e.g. *The Economist*, 2004) were the changing needs of their core readership, namely women. Readers in the new millennium had tired of "the formula traditionally thought to attract their interest: recipes, advice, a bit of hope", veteran Celebrity-news journalist and editor Bonnie Fuller told *The Economist* in 2004.

Fuller was the editor of American supermarket tabloid *Us Weekly* at the time the interview was conducted. "What they now want is their own version of the sports pages — a vicarious thrill, at someone else's expense. They don't just want tips; they want a diversion, some fun". An attempt to meet what were perceived as different needs in women readers in the new millennium could arguably also account for the kind of approach taken by Celebrity-news magazines in general, with an element of humour as a way to ensure "a diversion" and "some fun", and an element of scandal ensuring the "vicarious thrill, at someone else's expense" (*Ibid*.).

It is interesting to note Fuller's comparison of new-millennium Celebrity magazines, with their majority-women readership, with the 'sports pages', which traditionally have a male-dominated readership. There seems to be a hint in her comment that the new generation Celebrity magazines have been taking an almost masculine approach to their coverage, that they have been practising the kind of journalism usually associated with generally male-produced and -consumed sports pages in the newspapers. A masculine influence can certainly be traced in *heat*'s idiosyncratic tone, style and general approach to Celebrity news, not least, as Shaw (personal conversation, 21 January 2014) suggests, because the magazine is introduced as a kind of feminised version of the British men's magazine (or so-called 'lad mag') *FHM*, with the two magazine titles launched and owned by the same

publishing company both in the United Kingdom (Emap International Limited) and in South Africa (Emap/Media24). "The *heat* brand took its tone from the British lad mags", Shaw (*Ibid*.) explains, "using a very specific British way of speaking: dry, sarcastic, clever, witty and also sober".

In terms of voice, there is one last cluster of language devices that arguably distinguishes *Celebrity Proper* coverage specifically in *heat* but also perhaps in Celebrity magazines in general. These devices include the liberal use of first-person-plural pronouns ('we', 'us', 'our'). In addition, one could also identify the habit of these magazines to create, introduce and regularly use nicknames. These were even sometimes chosen specifically to convey allegiance to specific personalities, with unapologetic partiality forming part of *heat*'s idiosyncratic tone and style. When news broke of Brad Pitt's divorce from his television-actor wife Jennifer Aniston, best known a the time for her role in the popular sitcom *Friends*, because of his infidelity with Angelina Jolie, for instance, *heat* SA decided to be on 'Team Jen' and after some deliberations decided to nickname Angelina 'Ange' and not 'Angie', which was deemed as too friendly on the ear to convey the magazine's anger towards Angelina for robbing everyone's favourite 'friend' of her husband. Unique couple-combination nicknames were also a speciality, such as 'Brangelina' (Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie). *heat* SA also deliberately avoided using 'TomKat' to refer to the actor couple Tom Cruise and Katie Holmes, as this nickname was seen as too 'laddish'. Instead the magazine specifically devised Tomatie, and used this alternative nickname to distinguish its voice from that of its competitors.

Beside the use of custom nicknames and first-person pronouns, the other language device regularly employed was directly addressing the entertainment personalities themselves, almost as if they could be part of the magazine's readership. The magazine also assumed prior reader knowledge of personalities who were regularly covered in the magazine.

See for instance the coverage of the Kate Moss cocaine story arc, with the magazine's cover debuting Moss's alliterative and descriptive new nickname ("*Cocaine Kate"*), and the article inside making use of the first-person pronoun in the very first sentence: "*We've wondered what Kate Moss (31) sees in a deadbeat like Pete Doherty (26).*"[124]

[124] De Matos, Lara, "*This could cost Kate her career*", *heat*, 1–7 October 2005.

The cover claiming to prove Brad and Angelina's relationship[125] is a good example of the assumption of existing reader knowledge, of who the two stars in question are but, even more significantly, of what the "*exclusive pictures*" (one of which, showing the two stars as well as Angelina's adopted son Maddox on a beach, is used on the cover) actually prove (that they are having an affair.

Reader knowledge is also clearly assumed in the article on Paris Hilton's secret locker, as there is reference to the title of her first sex tape, *1 Night In Paris*, without any explanation of what it is. The "*heirhead*" nickname by which the magazine identifies Paris in the article also arguably makes the implicit assumption that readers will know the she is an hotel heiress and that her public image, involving elements of the 'ditzy dumb blonde', can be said to embody the idea of the homophonic 'airhead'. Paris was a 'regular' in "*What Were You Thinking?*" in the weekly "*Scandal!*" section, where personalities were often directly addressed in the copy. In the instalment of 6–12 November 2004, both Paris and actor Kate Beckinsale were directly addressed: "*Whoa there Paris, that sure is some frock!*"/"*Kate, you look more like a Christmas decoration than a Hollywood starlet*."

All of these linguistic features, including the direct address of the personalities, use of the first-person-plural pronoun, generous use of nicknames and the assumption of prior reader knowledge, can be read to work together to create the illusion that the magazine, the readers, and indeed the stars themselves are all family members and enjoy a close and cosy relationship that allows for scrutiny, critique and gossip without any fear of alienation thanks to the strength of the family bonds.

This can be seen as evidence of what Hermes (1995) calls the "extended-family repertoire" reason for reading Celebrity magazines. Engendering "a highly personal form of address in which solidarity and connectedness resound" (Hermes, 1995: 127), this repertoire "helps readers to live in a larger world than in real life – a world that is governed by emotional ties, that may be shaken by divorces and so on, but that is never seriously threatened" (Hermes, 1995:126).

The extended-family repertoire has been offered, by Leonard (2006) among others, as one of the reasons for the gossip-magazine market's rapid expansion in the first decade of the new millennium, with *heat* South Africa launch editor Melinda Shaw even going as far as wagering that stars were becoming more familiar than family members due to the amount

[125] *heat*, 7–13 May 2005.

of available information about their private lives: “There’s […] such a proliferation of info available on the A-list that anyone can feel they know them personally”, Shaw told Leonard (2006). “You can easily know more intimate, banal details about the life of a Hollywood star than you would of your cousin Betty in Cape Town”. In the same article, Chantell Marais from *Mense*, the Afrikaans sister magazine to *People*, which launched two years after *heat* SA, appears to explain how the extended-family repertoire ensures magazine sales and perhaps justifies the popular weekly frequency of Celebrity magazines when she argues that, “The better you know someone, the more interesting even the most banal details of their life become” (Leonard, 2006). She tells Leonard, “If your sister dyes her blonde hair black, or your cousin Betty finally dumps her cheating husband, you’re interested; you discuss it at a family gathering. The facts may be banal, but the people are so familiar that you care about even the trivial details of their lives […] We get so much info regularly about the inhabitants of Tinseltown that they become interesting on the same level”.

Psychological contextualisation of Celebrity scandal

Marais and Shaw’s references, in Charles Leonard’s 2006 *Mail & Guardian* article, to the fictional family member ‘Cousin Betty’, and thus the idea of the extended-family repertoire, is fascinating to consider in this analysis. These comments from the editors of *Mense* and *heat* SA respectively reveal a sense of gossip, a perennial favourite device, in magazines and other media, for the transmission of entertainment-personality news. The comments also seem to confirm that there is reader interest in story arcs involving scandal, especially scandal of a sexual nature (like Cousin Betty’s husband’s infidelity) alongside the interest in recent beauty and fashion (the sister changing her hair colour). Moreover, Marais and Shaw also seem to pick up on a concentrated focus on small details that may otherwise be considered banal or trivial, one of the distinguishing features of *Celebrity Proper* coverage.

The most interesting point in these comments, however, is the allusion to the ‘discussion’ at the family gathering of the latest happenings in Cousin Betty’s life. The last key distinguishing factor in coverage that surfaces the *Celebrity Proper* is a sense of discussion, of making sense of, or of contextualisation of the most recent events taking place in an entertainment personality’s life. In other words, typical *Celebrity Proper* representation includes an identifiable sense of contextualisation, specifically of recent questionable behaviour.

More specifically, this contextualisation includes rudimentary attempts by the magazines at psychological analysis, ‘psychobabble’ of sorts. Nunn and Biressi (2010: 53) argue that:

> Invoked by media commentators, 'experts' and the celebrity him/herself, the tropes of therapy – the family history, the consideration of sexuality as a motivating force in identity, the notion of unconscious drives to be identified and unpicked, the idea of the returning symptom, and so on – are now a compacted device for delving beneath the surface of the celebrity's persona both in particular moments and across career histories.

A main feature, punted on the cover of *heat*, on women in entertainment who appear to be particularly unfortunate in terms of romance is a good example of this attempt at psychological analysis.[126] Each of the six pages is devoted to one or two women. Used liberally, some of the photographs appear to be candid while others have obviously been shot in a studio; the pictures seem to have been selected for showing the women as glamorous yet not looking particularly happy, arguably to support the idea of their being "*unlucky in love*". In typical tabloid style, each entry has what looks like a torn-out excerpt from a regular newspaper-dating column giving the woman's romantic history in *heat* style, assuming much reader knowledge. UK pop singer Geri Halliwell's 'tear-out' reads: "*Petite blonde, 32, getting more buxom by the minute, likes yoga, photographers and small fluffy dogs. WLTM good looking, outgoing and generous guy who loves pop music. No heartbreakers or visiting Americans please*".

But it is in the 'diagnosis' following these individual truncated romantic histories that one truly gains a sense of psychological analysis. In capital letters *heat* purports to identify each woman's main 'problem'; for Geri it is that she, "*Always goes for bad boys!*". Then the justification follows, replete with intimate knowledge of the singer's domestic life (the reference that she lets her pet dog sleep in her bed). The pop singer 'confesses', and some advice from the 'magazine-as-therapist' follows, directly addressing the singer, in the imperative mood:

> *Men lust after Geri's reborn curves, but […] she remains the eternal singleton. It seems she can't resist naughty boys who can't provide the security she so desperately seeks, so she inevitably ends up alone and heartbroken. Geri's certainly roadtested a few fellas, including […] Robbie Williams, who called her a "demonic little girl" after they split; recovering drug addict Demian Warner (they split after he accused her of being too possessive) […] "As far as men go, you attract what you subconsciously believe you*

[126] "*Unlucky in Love*", *heat*, 11–17 September 2004.

deserve", admits Geri. Perhaps it's time to start having a higher opinion of yourself, love.

heat *verdict: Geri, find a decent man who won't do the dirty on you – and doesn't mind sharing a bed with your dog Harry.*

Disguised as well-meant, almost professional advice to the entertainers in the feature, yet subverting the serious 'agony aunt' tradition with humour, this coverage, of course, provides a way of "delving beneath the surface of the celebrity's persona" (Nunn & Biressi, 2010: 53) and contextualising them, at least in terms of their romantic misfortunes. By constantly providing this kind of contextualisation for its readers, mostly through piecing together bit of evidence in an attempt at psychological analysis, the magazine could be said to have constructed a constantly unfolding narrative of every personality's life.

A narrative of this kind is, of course, not an entirely new development in the realm of entertainment. As noted in Chapter 2, the American film industry in the first half of the 20th century successfully used narratives spanning both the public and (very often constructed) 'private' lives of its contracted actors to market its films. At first, private lives were constructed to correspond with the actors' public or on-screen image and not confuse audiences, but later private personalities started diverging from on-screen images, maximising, inflecting or resisting on-screen social typification. This was possibly done in an attempt, by the film-production studios, to present the public with a narrative of a more textured, and seemingly authentic, star. The fanzine, the early 20th century predecessor of the later-century weekly Celebrity magazines, was one of the main marketing vehicles carrying this narrative on behalf of the film industry.

However, with the disbandment of the American film studio system towards the middle of the century, the screen artists "lost access to the tightly run publicity machine" (Sternheimer 2011: 148), which meant they finally had the freedom to control their own images on the one hand, but they simultaneously lost the protection they had, specifically against bad publicity.

No longer marketing tools for the Hollywood film industry but owned by independent publishers, entertainment-personality magazines around the turn of the 20th century pounced on this kind of material. Without the proper contextualisation, the coherent narrative framework that was constructed and maintained by the Hollywood production studios, magazine coverage of entertainers typically became disconnected and disjointed.

Yet as the personalities became more adept at managing their own image, often by appointing a team of experts including publicists, representatives and agents, the narrative element returned. For instance, the incorporation of a hint of the scandalous into the image, characteristic of the *Celebrity Proper* figure, could be read as an attempt at representing a coherent yet textured image, a 'human' narrative. Since entertainment personalities were generally celebrated in their own lifetime, it was a constantly unfolding narrative that had the potential to change its *leitmotif* in order to increase its commercial appeal. Neal Gabler (2001: 4) is one of the few to have noted a specific narrative element in the construction of modern Celebrity:

> What turns a famous person into a celebrity? The grand answer, on empirical evidence, seems to be narrative. The main reason we want to read about certain individuals in supermarket tabloids […] or we want to watch television reports about them […] is that we are interested in their stories.

Gabler (2001: 4, original emphasis retained) further identifies the modern Celebrity as "human entertainment" or "a person who, by the very process of *living*, provide[s] entertainment". The source of this entertainment is the "plotline", Gabler (2001: 5) argues, seemingly corroborating, with a host of examples ranging from actor Matthew Perry's drug addiction to Jesse Jackson's illegitimate child, the argument offered here, that the most interesting plotlines or story arcs include an element of scandal. Modern entertainers, Gabler writes, "are living out narratives that capture our interest and the interest of the media —narratives that have entertainment value. Or put another way, what stars are to traditional movies, celebrities are to […] the "life movie" — a movie written in the medium of life" (Gabler, 2001: 5).

Unlike the narratives constructed by the Hollywood studios for their contracted stars in the early 20th century, the Celebrity story arcs of the late 20th and early 21st century vary in quality and coherence, with some entertainers and their representatives more accomplished in the business of image-making than others. Much has been written, for instance, about entertainment personalities displaying superior deftness in managing their own image.[127] At the same time, since the Celebrity weeklies were now independent of the production studios and subsequently of the entertainers themselves, they were not privy to the underlying narratives constructed by the stars and their image-makers. Thus, the kind of representation appearing in these magazines was the result of a constant negotiation

[127] See, for instance, readings of Angelina Jolie (Hoggard 2010), Beyoncé Knowles (Cashmore 2010) and Charlize Theron (Petersen 2017).

process between the personalities and the magazines: what was to remain hidden and what was to be exposed and, more importantly, how could every new story arc, every new snippet of information, every new set of photographs, be contextualised. Sometimes these modern Celebrity magazines were themselves instrumental in the production of the narrative, providing background and context by way of amateur psychological analysis, while at other times they were mere 'consumers', like their readers in a sense, consuming what the personalities revealed and speculating about the meaning of the latest behaviour or fashions to be captured on celluloid.

Conclusion

As a *heat* SA staff member in the early 2000s, I became adept at what we called 'heating up' copy. This involved emphasising certain details of the story, adding varying degrees of humour, satire and irony but also, crucially, by providing context for our readers by analysing the latest, often very small, twists and turns in the collection of entertainment-personality story arcs we were following at any particular point. Picking up on the unfolding "therapeutic narrative" (Nunn & Biressi, 2010: 53) of the entertainers who were 'hot' for our readership at the time, we would carefully consider whether and how the large amounts of photographic evidence we would receive on a daily basis could be used to support our particular reading.

The carefully considered editorial approach, evident from *heat* SA's so-called 'brand book', guiding this particular type of weekly coverage, and, consequently, the famous figure emerging from the pages of the magazine, set out its distinguishing characteristics. Scandalous storylines were given preference, especially those for which we had possible visual evidence, and for the rest, the editorial approach relied on satire, humour and contextualisation to make it ultimately compelling enough to ensure that readers would return for another episode of Celebrity news, week after week.

The craft of Celebrity journalism, a relatively newly formalised area of specialisation that *heat* arguably pioneered, at least in South Africa, was as fascinating as the *Celebrity Proper* figure itself. As was acknowledged above, this *Celebrity Proper* figure was the understanding of fame that triggered the interest in this project in the first place. While I was writing up the thesis, I considered calling this category the *Established Celebrity*, as it immediately succeeded the *Emerging Celebrity*.

But then, as we entered the second decade of the new millennium, the Celebrity figure gradually proved itself to be somewhat ephemeral, perhaps even as fleeting as some of the entertainment personalities who can be said to be prime examples of this early 21st-century understanding of fame, and the adjective 'established' was not so suitable any more.

The dominance of the *Celebrity Proper* dwindled for a number of reasons, some of which are arguably beyond the scope of this thesis. But what can be said is that print media as a whole started facing the threat of digital publishing. Weekly Celebrity print magazines were particularly vulnerable, as readers started demanding immediate and free access to showbusiness news, specifically visual material: the photographs that had previously guaranteed exclusivity and, subsequently, sales for the printed magazines. In South Africa, the "*Cocaine Kate*" and Joost van der Westhuizen 'video scandal' photographs and coverage were, for instance, only available locally in *heat* (and the Media24 newspaper *Rapport* in the case of Joost) and unavailable in digital format or online, hence guaranteed magazine sales. But once digitisation created the opportunity for this kind of content to be available immediately, and often free of charge, the demand for printed Celebrity magazines started to diminish.

This is what Olivier Royant, editor in chief of the French weekly showbusiness-lifestyle magazine *Paris Match*, seems to be hinting at with his comment that: "Today the user is connecting with our brand 10 times a day. It's no longer about who gets the scoop when the information is all over the internet. Now it's about who can get that exclusive headline up on the platform first. It's about speed. From the weekly to the moment" (Moss 2016). A renowned figure in international publishing, who "played a pivotal role in [*Paris Match*'s] digital transformation" (Moss 2016), Royant made the comment in Cape Town during a Media24 conference.

A year earlier, Media24 gave digitisation as the main justification for its closure of *heat* SA in 2015, just over a decade after its 2004 launch. "For breaking celebrity news the internet has become the source for celebrity junkies and we are well positioned to capitalise on this through our fast-growing celebrity sites", Minette Ferreira, then head of weekly magazines at Media24, said in the official press statement announcing the closure (TMO Reporter 2015). *heat* SA was the only local Celebrity-only print title, with its competitors, including *Huisgenoot*, *You*, *Drum*, *Move!* and *People* all categorised as family magazines. In other words, the demise of *heat* spelled the end of the Celebrity-only title in South Africa and

could be said to have heralded the death of the true Celebrity Proper figure – on the local landscape and in print coverage, at least.

Ferreira linked the company's decision to both local and international trends: "It is always difficult to close a magazine but international and local trends show that celebrity-only print titles are in decline", she commented to the industry magazine *The Media Online* (*Ibid.*). However, some of these international Celebrity-only print titles continued to survive despite lower sales figures, ostensibly the result of digitisation, with the original UK edition of *heat* and the American *US Weekly* being two prominent examples.

However, and this is a crucial observation, the early indications seem to be that, despite the continued survival, globally, of some Celebrity-only print titles, moving towards the third decade of the 21st century, the *Celebrity Proper* itself was on the decline in print, both locally and internationally. Despite its demise, the brief presence of this figure on the local landscape, in *heat* SA, seemed to have made an impression on its competitor titles, with the occasional reminders of the *Celebrity Proper* appearing in the surviving weeklies. But, as the discussion in the next and final chapter will attempt to show, the post-*heat* understanding of fame appears not to have one or more distinctive characteristics setting it apart, as its predecessors did.

Over and above digitisation, there seemed to be one other significant 'threat' to what could be described as the *Celebrity Proper* in print. It could be argued that the growing trend to include armchair psychological analysis to contextualise behaviour, and especially what could be portrayed as misbehaviour, of entertainment personalities, challenged the figure's survival. Nunn and Biressi (2010: 53) write that this psychological analysis "is frequently the means to shift the story of celebrity transgression beyond initial shock, outrage and disdain into a new field of self-inspection and public reparation". "Therapeutic narrative" is how Nunn and Biressi (2010: 53) describe this form of analysis. And it could be suggested that it is the notion of the treatment of mental illness, which is implicated by the word "therapeutic", that eventually threatens the survival of the *Celebrity Proper*. Balancing relatively superficial psychological analysis of risqué behaviour with a satirical, ironic editorial voice becomes highly problematic, even unsustainable, when there is a real possibility of intense conflict and suffering evident in the behaviour.

Early *heat* UK editor Mark Frith, credited as being the mastermind behind the original *heat* editorial formula, seems to acknowledge, in his 2008 memoirs, the limitations of the continuous pursuit, in the coverage, of transgressive behaviour. One could perhaps argue

that the preference for coverage of ever-more transgressive behaviour combined with the growing trend, in 21st-century weeklies, to include psychological analysis as a form of contextualisation of this behaviour, made the craft of Celebrity journalism rather tedious, and, crucially, the *Celebrity Proper* rather bleak. Faced with the prospect of a potentially unappealing figure that would in a sense appal, rather than appeal to, the readership, Celebrity weeklies, it could be argued, had to revise their editorial formula again, which would lead to the emergence of another permutation of the existing characteristics of fame.

Chapter 5:
The *Figure Now*

While I was in the final stages of writing the previous chapter, in the early months of 2017, Joost van der Westhuizen, once a captain of the South African national rugby team, died. He succumbed, at the age of forty-five, to motor neurone disease (MND), an illness with which he had first been officially diagnosed in 2011.

Two of the local magazines examined during this project carried tribute sections the week immediately following Joost's death: *Huisgenoot* (as well as its English-medium sister magazine, *YOU*)[128] and *People*.[129] The term 'tribute', with its associated meanings of admiration and respect, reflects the general thrust of the posthumous coverage, which could be described as hagiographic. 'Joost the Hero' dominated the tribute sections with ample reference to his achievements on the rugby field but also what was depicted as an exceptionally courageous fight, on behalf of others, against the debilitating MND that ended up claiming his life. In addition, the tributes surfaced Joost in the way he had emerged in the weekly magazines during his lifetime, namely as, to use the terminology adhered to here, a *Star* and also as an *Emerging Celebrity*. There were even limited and relatively cautious references to the story arc involving the 'sex and drugs video' that briefly appeared to qualify him as a *Celebrity Proper* figure in 2009.

In other words, at various points in the magazine coverage following his tragic, premature death and during the course of his life, Joost was represented as all four of the core figures identified here. Considering the way in which the weekly magazines covered Joost in life and in death allowed for a comprehensive reflection on the trajectory of 20th century fame proposed here. Furthermore, the Joost coverage opened up the possibility of considering whether a new category of fame should be proposed, and if so, what distinct features would characterise such a category. The process again led to a consideration of the three questions guiding the process of categorisation itself: *who* warrants, achieves or merits coverage in South African magazines?; *what* characteristics or elements are they covered for, or *why* are they covered in these magazines?; and finally, *how* do these magazines cover them, or in what form does the coverage appear?

[128] *YOU* launched in 1986.
[129] The tributes appeared in *People*, 17 February 2017 and the *Huisgenoot* and *YOU* editions of 16 February 2017.

5.1 Dispersal and hybridity in *The Figure Now*

We continue to see the emergence of figures that roughly fit into the *Star* and *Emerging Celebrity* and *Celebrity Proper* categories as defined in the relevant chapters, with the odd Hero also making an appearance.

In other words, it could be tentatively suggested that the main kind of fame in weekly magazines as we move towards the middle of the century encompasses elements of all four of the major categories of fame explored here. But this statement needs some qualification. It is important to bear in mind that the analysis throughout has been of the 'dominant' or 'main' form of fame. In other words, in any issue of a weekly magazine title, the focus was on what type of figure emerged *most prominently*.

At the beginning of the 20th century, almost all the people covered in *Huisgenoot* could, for instance, be described as true to the notion of the Hero, most of them in the epic sense. In 1950s *Drum*, substantial sections in the coverage surfaced the *Star* figure. Then, the main focus of most of the coverage in 1980s *People* and *heat* in the new millennium emphasised elements of flaw, whether imperfection or ill-judged behaviour, and this supposedly 'flawed' figure was named first named here as the *Emerging Celebrity* and subsequently the *Celebrity Proper*. So the analysis identified four distinct figures or categories: the *Epic Hero*, the *Star,* the *Emerging Celebrity* and the *Celebrity Proper*.

But, crucially, in the magazine coverage post-Celebrity, it has become a challenge to identify one single figure displaying any kind of distinctly new trait or characteristic, and this applies to both local and international magazines. Early indications are that coverage for the most part surfaces characteristics of not one but two of the existing figures, the *Star* and the *Emerging Celebrity*. Occasionally there is still coverage that seems to surface elements of the *Celebrity Proper* figure. Qualities associated with the Hero appear even more sporadically, and the 'epic' element can be said to be entirely absent. The personalities associated with heroic traits are not politicians or captains of industry, as was the general case, for instance, in *Huisgenoot* a century before. Rather, we find the magazines most often celebrating heroic traits in sportspeople, with Joost van der Westhuizen being a good example here. The obvious link between heroism and sport has been pointed out before, with Turner (2004: 19) noting that sportspeople are "especially articulated to discourses of achievement, excellence and transcendence", which are all, of course, elements that also apply to the definition of the Hero.

So one could argue that naming this chapter exploring the specific brand of fame that is emerging in weekly magazine coverage towards the middle of the 21st century as the '*Figure Now*' is, in a sense, problematic. There is not one 'figure' that emerges most strongly or prominently. Rather, there are two, or occasionally even three, categories of fame that emerge equally strongly in coverage of people in any given issue of a weekly magazine. Moreover, when one considers the reasons for being covered, and which elements are given prominence in the coverage, there are no distinctly new elements that would give one reason to propose a distinctly new figure. To accurately capture this last understanding of fame evident in weekly magazine coverage, it seems the focus has to move away from a figure and even a category, as such, and more towards an understanding that encompasses a 'dispersal' of characteristics or traits of all three the previous understandings of fame in the trajectory proposed here.

Interestingly, judging by the literature on fame practised and represented on online and on social media, what we appear to be witnessing in the (traditional) magazine medium extends to the 'new' media as well. Despite offering increased visibility, the multiplicity of new media cannot be said to have convincingly surfaced a consistent, entirely new form of fame. There seems to be a dispersal of characteristics of previous understandings of fame as well as a continuation, via these electronic media, of the forms of fame we have witnessed in other media throughout the previous century.

For instance, Marshall (2010: 46), argues that, "Past celebrity discourse, with its textual and more significantly extra-textual dimensions that revealed an interrelation between the public and the private self, has served as the template for the production of the on-line self". Referring specifically to the "Twitterverse", Sarah Thomas (2014: 242) adds that, "[W]hile Twitter may represent a deviation from older models of stardom, there remain important continuities and contexts between 'old' and 'new' celebrity behaviours and media forms […] many online practices characterised as new have clear antecedents in wider histories of stardom". And with reference to the "Instafame" acquired on the image-sharing social networking service Instagram, Alice Marwick (2015: 157) argues that this social medium reinforces "traditional hierarchies of fame".

Returning to fame as it emerges in traditional print magazines, the difficulty to identify a distinctly new category is perhaps also evident in the fact that it seemed impossible to pick one specific weekly title as being the ultimate medium for the analysis of the *Figure Now*. This is in contrast to the way in which the *Epic Hero* could be said to have been almost

synonymous with early 20th-century *Huisgenoot*, the *Star* figure of 1950s *Drum* has become iconic, and *People* and *heat* have come to be strongly associated with the heartbreak and scandal that, it has been argued, distinguishes the *Emerging Celebrity* and *Celebrity Proper* figures. The distinctions in the coverage of showbusiness personalities between the different local weekly magazines on the market (which included *Huisgenoot*, *YOU*, *Drum*, *People* and *Move!*) seem to be very subtle. In general, it could be said that all of these magazines, sometimes within one weekly issue and sometimes over various issues, emphasise different characteristics in their coverage of showbusiness personalities that would lead to the surfacing of *Star* and Celebrity and, occasionally, Hero figures.

It is interesting to reflect on the shifts that happened within a century and, in some instances, within the same titles, to a large extent because of globalisation. Early 20th-century *Huisgenoot* was one of only a handful of South African magazines, almost all of them aimed at a white Afrikaans-speaking readership, and its coverage surfaced the *Epic Hero* figure. This figure was dominant in *Huisgenoot* despite major shifts, both locally and internationally, towards coverage of entertainers. In other words, the *Epic Hero* retained its dominant position in *Huisgenoot* for a longer period of time compared to movements on the international magazine-publishing front. *Drum* from the 1950s followed publications elsewhere, arguably adapting an international formula, which originally had been devised to market white US film actors. But it selected local black entertainers for *Star* representation for its almost exclusively black African readership.

Towards the end of the 20th century, both *Drum* and *Huisgenoot* belonged to the same publishing house, *Nasionale Pers* (with its newspaper, magazine and online publication division now known as Media24), and, together with *Huisgenoot*'s English equivalent, *YOU*, their coverage surfaced the same kind of figure, even though the entertainment personalities themselves were selected to suit the white Afrikaans, white English-speaking and black readerships of *Huisgenoot*, *YOU* and *Drum* respectively. In terms of who was selected for coverage, what features were emphasised in the coverage and the style of the coverage, the dominant figure that emerged in these three local magazines was also generally very much like that represented in magazines globally.

The global influence was undeniable when it came to local coverage surfacing the Celebrity around the turn of the 20th century. Both the *People* and *heat* brands had international links. *People* SA, in which the *Emerging Celebrity* dominated, had an eponymous brand in the United States, and *heat* SA, which surfaced the *Celebrity Proper*, was an international

franchise of the UK brand. Furthermore, international personalities from the United States and, to a lesser extent, the United Kingdom were in the majority in the coverage of both these magazines. Most importantly, however, the global influence could also be seen in the coverage style employed by the local magazines. In other words, not only was there a preference for international entertainment personalities, the way in which they, as well as the select few local personalities, were covered, corresponded with what was happening on the entertainment publishing front abroad.

As the world has become ever more interconnected, and connection speeds are becoming increasingly faster, the trend to remain in sync with Celebrity-magazine coverage in other parts of the world, specifically in terms of style, focus and execution, seems to continue in local magazines in the new millennium. Put differently, compared to previous forms of fame, it is difficult to understand the *Figure Now* mainly in terms of the local context; rather, the global influence has become dominant and all-important, and could be said to eclipse the local.

Thus, in both local and international titles, we now see how the same individual person might, in different issues of a magazine or even sometimes in different sections of one issue, straddle more than one of the definitions of fame, sometimes emerging as a *Star* and at other times an *Emerging Celebrity* or a *Celebrity Proper*, and perhaps, once in a while, a Hero. Because one individual person can emerge in terms of the different categories of fame suggested here, one could say that this new post-Celebrity understanding is a 'mixed' or 'hybrid' form of fame. A sense of hybridity is another characteristic of *The Figure Now* that appears, from the literature, to extend to fame represented in magazines to that as practised and presented on the new media. Marshall (2010: 35, emphasis added) defines the social network sites as "presentational media", as they are a "form of presentation of the self and [produce] this new *hybrid* among the personal, interpersonal and the mediated".

It must be noted, however, that in terms of hybridity in the printed magazines, one personality would for the most part be covered in terms of two *consecutive* categories in the trajectory, so mostly as a *Star* and an *Emerging Celebrity*, or occasionally as a Hero and a *Star*. One could say that this coverage in terms of consecutive categories contributed to the representation of each personality in terms of a coherent personal narrative, which has been shown as a strong characteristic of the *Celebrity Proper*. It is again interesting to see how this endeavour for coherence of the personal narrative has influenced online fame. In particular, the work of Theresa Senft (2015: 346) about what she calls the 'microcelebrity' is

of interest here. She coined this term while researching girls "broadcasting their lives over the Internet" in the first decade of the new millennium, and notes how since then, "the discourse of "brand me" has exploded into the public sphere. She further defines the microcelebrity practice as "the commitment to deploying and maintaining one's online identity as if it were a branded good", and for me a sense of maintaining and guarding a coherent image (online in this case) is one of the elements permeating the idea of a 'brand', and this definition in general. In this instance, the online or presentational media, to use Marshall's (2010) term, can be said to continue, in a way, a kind of fame that could be witnessed in the representational medium of the magazine.

In the *Figure Now* as represented in weekly magazines in South Africa and elsewhere, the continued focus on a coherent narrative seems to have resulted in hardly any straddling of the Hero and *Celebrity Proper* categories, the odd exception, such as Joost van der Westhuizen, who was represented as all four figures in the trajectory, notwithstanding. The fact that the Hero and the *Celebrity Proper* do not mingle well is perhaps not surprising, as these two extreme ends of the trajectory seem to be incompatible.

In this regard, and with reference to the coverage of Joost, it is interesting to consider how the term 'sport' is easily combined with both 'hero' and 'star'; both 'sports star' and 'sporting hero' are familiar titles and seem to fall easy on the ear. Not so with the title 'sport/sporting Celebrity', which sounds awkward and is rarely, if ever, used. Critically, this could be read as indicative of a wider trend in magazine coverage of fame, namely of the uncomfortable, perhaps even impossible, sustained general co-existence of heroism and Celebrity, in the representation of one person and in coverage generally.

This straddling of the first two categories of the trajectory is evident, for instance, in the coverage in *YOU* of former US President Barack Obama's visit with billionaire businessman Richard Branson on his private Caribbean island.[130] The notion of the heroic is undeniably present in the coverage, yet it stands in stark contrast to *Huisgenoot*'s brand of heroism a century before. As a politician and the first black president of the United States, Obama naturally brings a heroic element, which is generously amplified by photographs showing his model-like body while learning to kite surf in the waves on Necker Island, and mock-fighting with Branson on his private yacht. The copy also maintains the more formal convention of referring to both men by their last names, generally associated with news reporting and coverage of politicians; by contrast, as has been argued in preceding chapters, magazine

[130] Cook, Sandy (compiler), "*It's so bromantic"*, *YOU*, 23 February 2017.

coverage of showbusiness personalities has since its inception been more oriented towards the personal, and has thus used the more familiar and intimate convention of first names instead of surnames for second and subsequent references.

But the fact that the focus of this *YOU* article is predominantly on activities in Obama's private life, on Branson's exclusive private island no less, as the copy reminds us, "*on his first holiday post-Potus* [President of the United States, the acronym Obama used specifically on social media while holding office]", also emphasises a sense of stardom here. The images of his toned physique support the notion of the heroic in the sense of the sports player. Yet the intense focus on his body, with the copy commenting specifically on its attractiveness, describing him in the photograph captions as, "*looking buff, relaxed and frankly damn hot*", reveals a simultaneous inclination towards coverage befitting of the *Star*. This is further emphasised by a sense of the extraordinary lifestyle the former president maintains in the private sphere. The copy notes how Obama and his wife, Michelle Obama, spent "*a few carefree weeks at [Richard Branson's] ultra-luxurious retreat […] a sliver of paradise*" and "*enjoyed sundowners on the terraces of the sprawling dwelling Branson built at the water's edge*".

One individual person being represented as simultaneously encompassing characteristics that fall in more than one of the existing categories seems to be a continuing, perhaps even growing trend in showbusiness journalism, as this *YOU* article illustrates. Put differently, one cannot identify one dominant type of figure emerging here; rather, we see the coverage making reference to individual characteristics of existing understandings of fame but no one form dominates or overshadows the other, as was the case with earlier understandings of fame. Even a politician and pioneering president, who in previous years would have been represented exclusively as an *Epic Hero* with no possibility arising in the coverage for any other kind of classification of fame, can now be covered, in the same article, as both a Hero and a *Star*.

Given how hybridity has arguably come to characterise the *Figure Now* in the entertainment weeklies, it is interesting to consider how showbusiness and showbusiness journalism has seemingly influenced other sectors of society, and specifically politics, in the new millennium. Politicians rarely appear in the weekly entertainment magazines, and if they do, they hardly ever appear in prominent positions, such as on the cover. In the South African weeklies it is furthermore interesting to note that local politicians are almost entirely absent from coverage. In other words, politicians very sporadically appear in the local magazines I

examined, and on these rare occasions international politicians are favoured above South African ones. As is the case with the Obama article in *YOU*, the predominant focus of the coverage of these politicians is on their private lives and particularly their *Star*-like qualities. This could perhaps partly explain the remarkably low *local* politician presence in the South African weeklies. Glamour, one of the quintessential *Star* qualities, is not something that seems to come naturally for South African politicians, which makes *Star*-like magazine coverage particularly tricky. Some local politicians are also known for extreme private-life excesses, including palatial private residences, expensive cars and luxury international holidays. Subsequently, these politicians could potentially be covered in a *Star*-like way in the weekly magazines, reminiscent of the 'old Hollywood' way. Yet it could be argued that these excesses might not appeal to readers in a country known for government corruption and with such pronounced income inequality. What I have attempted to show and account for here is how a global trend, of politicians being largely absent from coverage in weekly showbusiness magazines, has an added layer of complexity in the local South African context.

What is also interesting about the general global absence of politicians in the weekly magazines is that the notion of the 'celebrity politician' has nevertheless attracted growing interest from a wide range of fields, as Mark Wheeler argues in the introduction to his book *Celebrity Politics: Image and Identity in Contemporary Political Communications* (2013).

On the one hand, the notion involves politicians behaving like entertainers, while on the other it concerns entertainers behaving like politicians. The body of literature is constantly growing, but some key scholarship includes Andrew Cooper (2007), who writes about "celebrity diplomacy" with particular reference to actors and sports players who have been appointed as United Nations ambassadors and special envoys. Where Cooper has written about entertainers fulfilling political functions, Douglas Kellner and Redmond have taken a particular interest in the reverse, namely politicians covered or represented in terms of qualities that have more generally been associated with showbusiness personalities. It is clear that Obama is a fruitful example in terms of this trend, as both Kellner and Redmond have written specifically about the former US president. Kellner (2009: 715) argues that Obama "has become a master of the spectacle and global celebrity of the top rank […] a supercelebrity", while Redmond (2010: 81) describes him as "the leading illustration of what is the expanded nexus of celebrity, spectacle and politics".

Interestingly, some see the new-millennium trend of 'celebrity politicians' as alarming, arguing that their looks or outward appearance and manner "dazzle" or blind people to possibly controversial politics. With specific reference to Obama (alongside Donald Trump, Emmanuel Macron and Aung San Suu Kyi), Pankaj Mishra (2017) writes about the recently exposed:

> insidious politics of celebrity, one in which a redemptive personality is projected high above the slow toil of political parties and movements […] Public life routinely features such sensations, figures in whom people invest great expectations based on nothing more than a captivation with their radiant personas.

Furthermore, an article by Perry Anderson (2017) describes Obama as the "first celebrity President" by virtue of him being "other than purely white, as well as good-looking and mellifluous". But Obama's good looks and eloquence does not equate to leadership, Anderson (2017) argues:

> Obama, relishing his aura and aware of the risks of diluting it, made little attempt to mobilize the populace who cast their ballots for him, and reserved the largesse showered on him by big money for further acclamation at the polls. What mattered was his personal popularity. His party hardly counted, and his policies had little political carry-through.

Yet, despite this criticism of the 'celebrity politician', there are now entire weekly magazines whose editorial policies are based on a deliberate blurring of categories of fame. *Grazia*, an Italian weekly magazine brand dating back to the late 1930s that also briefly published a South African edition (from 2012 to 2016), is one such example. It markets itself as a fashion and 'celebrity' title, but its upfront news section (titled 10 Hot Stories) always contains at least one, but generally even more, women-interest 'hard news' item. Thus, it is common, even expected, for *Grazia* to cover, on a regular basis, political or humanitarian events of various kinds involving prominent women, which ensures that there is a general sense of the exemplary permeating the magazine, albeit often subtly. Yet even in articles that exclusively refer to political events and avoid reference to the private life of the women involved, the magazine almost always adopts the *Star* formula or blueprint. It, for instance, uses first names instead of surnames to refer even to politicians and businesswomen. The magazine tends to be guided in the story-selection process by appearance or looks and also, importantly, sartorial sense, which is of course reminiscent of the *Star* formula or blueprint. By way of illustration: fashionable high-profile international human rights lawyer Amal

Clooney, who is married to Hollywood actor George Clooney, can probably be said to be the ideal *Grazia* subject. This arguably "sexist focus on appearance" in the magazine's general editorial policy, towards all the women it covers, including those not primarily involved in entertainment, has, unsurprisingly, drawn sharp criticism, as Van Zoonen and Harmer (2011: 94) note. The international *Grazia* franchise's general focus on appearance arguably added a layer of complexity in the South African edition. In patriarchal South Africa, women are in the minority in politics and industry, which limited *Grazia* SA's options in terms of local figures to be selected for coverage. In addition, as has been argued before in this chapter, applying the *Star* formula to prominent figures in business and politics in an environment in which there is arguably a complex relationship with outward appearance and glamour in general is a challenging endeavour.

The odd human-rights lawyer and former president notwithstanding, if one considers the question of *who* is selected for coverage, we still see weekly magazines in South Africa and globally mostly opting for entertainers, primarily those hailing from the film and music industries and the sports arena but also from television, and even the internet and social media. The preference for showbusiness personalities has been the status quo in weekly magazines both locally and internationally from the middle of the 20th century onwards.

Compared to the '*few* good men' dominating coverage in South Africa in the first few decades of the last century, we see an ever-greater number of personalities being represented in magazines now. Some of these personalities, often those in the traditional fame industries of film, music and sports, have longevity in terms of magazine representation and will appear every so often over a long period of time, whereas others, typically those who initially gained fame in the fields of television, the internet or social media, seem to be ever more ephemeral and might be included in coverage for only a brief period. This particularly seems to be the case for personalities who first became known through the new or social media.

The magazines continue to cover these entertainers primarily for activities in their private lives, with relationship stories dominating. If one looks at *how* the magazines represent these personalities, or the style of the representation, the trend for shorter pieces of text or copy and predominantly visual coverage also persists. But, and this is one of the big distinctions that can be drawn, in terms of the latter there seems to be a shift away from the early 21st-century propensity for using photographs as proof or evidence of what is presented as 'flaw', be it physical or otherwise.

Move!, a South African weekly launched in 2005 and aimed at an aspiring middle-class black women readership, for instance, shuns paparazzi images. The magazine almost exclusively uses photographs shot in studio to illustrate its regular weekly collection of articles on showbusiness personalities, a large percentage of which covers scandals and emphasises sensational elements. On one double-page spread from this magazine, for instance, a head and shoulders photograph of a smiling Brickz (real name: Sipho Ndlovu) accompanies an exposé of intimate details of the local kwaito singer's sexual exploits, including allegations of a "*threesome*" with his wife and "*a magosha* [prostitute]".[131]

On the opposite page, a professionally styled full-length photograph of Thembi Nyandeni looking defiantly at the camera accompanies a story in which the sixty-three-year-old local actor denies rumours that she is in a sex tape.[132] Despite images from the sex tape, which "*went viral*", the article notes, and probably being available for use, *Move!* did not publish any of these. In other words, by all accounts, it had the opportunity to provide evidence of the video scandal and represent Thembi as a *Celebrity Proper* figure, but the magazine avoided this treatment. There is even perhaps a hint of the steadfast and principled in her comment that, "*I have morals. I have rules and regulations that I live by on a daily basis*". Were it not for the notion of an inner life, perhaps even a suggestion of the confessional, coming through in Thembi's declaration, one would be tempted to identify a sense of the heroic here. The point is that, even in a magazine such as *Move!*, with its apparent predilection for entertainment-personality transgression, photographs are hardly ever used as evidence. Even if the personalities are supposedly 'behaving badly', the accompanying pictures always show them looking good.

In fact, there was an overwhelming sense of personalities 'looking good' as I examined the showbusiness-news sections of the other local weekly magazines. In the majority of the photographs, which illustrate private-life stories, those covered are smiling. They look happy, healthy and decidedly glamorous. Put differently, the coverage style seems to have shifted somewhat away from a focus on physical flaws and moved towards evidence of glamour, health and happiness. Spread upon spread upon spread of grainy photographs, most of them seemingly unauthorised and shot by the paparazzi, of supposed physical imperfection and bad fashion choices, now seem to be disappearing. Gone, it seems, is the 'bad hair day' and the 'wardrobe malfunction'.

[131] Mdakane, Bongani, "*Brickz's wife happy to share him*", *Move!*, 17 May 2017.
[132] Zenoyise, John, "*Isibaya actress fed-up of sex tape*", *Move!*, 17 May 2017.

Consequently, the gallery of red-carpet photographs of stars in haute couture, which has started appearing weekly on the last few pages of *YOU* and *Huisgenoot* since the last few years of the 20th century, can almost be said to set the tone for the visual style of local weekly magazine coverage of showbusiness personalities generally. This *YOU*/*Huisgenoot* feature (called "*Stargaze*" and "*Sterrekyk*" respectively) has subtly changed over the years, with visual elements such as twinkles and shimmery backdrops added, to heighten the glossy effect for which these pages have been aiming. Besides these unmistakably glamorous, posed red-carpet shots, images from the personalities' own social-media accounts, which are arguably intended to be visually appealing and are even often digitally manipulated for this purpose, are increasingly incorporated into weekly-magazine coverage and support this sense of 'shiny happy people' on holiday on the beach or in exotic destinations all over the globe.

In addition to the large-scale disappearance of photographs purporting to 'prove' physical imperfection, the copy dealing with the physical aspect of the entertainer's body tends not to emphasise a notion of imperfection or flaw. Instead, there seems to be a preference for healthy body-image stories, even perhaps moving towards a more activist stance on the part of the magazines. One of the recent *Huisgenoot*/*YOU* issues, for instance, featured pop star Lady Gaga's response, on social media, to "*the trolls who body-shamed her Super Bowl halftime performance*".[133] The roughly 250-word story in the gossipy "*Have You Heard?*" section of the magazine opens with a direct rhetorical question to *Huisgenoot/YOU* readers: "*Does this look like a fat stomach to you?*", before giving background to what prompted Lady Gaga's Instagram posts and then quoting from the response itself: "*I heard my body is a topic of conversation so I wanted to say, I'm proud of my body and you should be proud of yours too […]*". Accompanying the story are screenshots of the Instagram post as well as a photograph of Lady Gaga (real name: Stefani Germanotta) performing in shimmery sequinned hot pants, American football shoulder-pad-like cropped jacket and fishnet stockings, an outfit that was designed by the House of Versace, on stage at the Super Bowl. On the same page there is also a small story about an Instagram post from pop star Pink who "*joked […] about losing her baby flab after giving birth to her second child*". "*[W]eek 6 post baby and I haven't lost ANY WEIGHT YET!!!!!! Yay mee!! I'm normal*", the magazines quote from Pink's account, with a head and shoulders image of Pink in reflective sunglasses and a friend and also one of her new baby, Jameson Moon Hart, in a babygro that says Straight Outta Mumma, accompanying the story.

[133] "*Gaga hits back*", *YOU*, 23 February 2017.

Significantly, the retreat from 'physical' imperfection coverage seems to be indicative of a wider general departure from representation that prefers to surface the notion of flaw, specifically of the kind that has typically come to rely on paparazzi-type photography used as evidence of activity or behaviour that is then construed as morally transgressive in some way. In particular, there seems to be a deliberate withdrawal from coverage of addictions and other self-destructive behaviour that have the potential to lead to criminal charges, institutionalisation or, in some cases, even death.

Rather, the dominant focus seems to return to the kind of private-life stories that used to represent the *Star* and *Emerging Celebrity* figure in weekly magazines from the middle up to the end of the 20th century. Reminiscent of the Hollywood fanzines of the early 20th century, stories of high-profile romances abound in South African weeklies, such as in the coverage of the steady relationship between the United Kingdom's Prince Harry and his "*sexy Suits actress*" girlfriend Meghan Markle, which *YOU*/*Huisgenoot* claim is "*getting serious*" (and which eventually proved to be, as they later got married).[134] Closer to home, national cricket player Wayne Parnell's "*sprokiestroue*" (fairy-tale wedding) and marriage to beauty and fashion blogger Aisha Baker also gets the '*Star* treatment' in *Huisgenoot*,[135] as do countless stories about showbusiness couples expecting babies, including local DJ Fix and her husband and, internationally, George and Amal Clooney, musician couple Beyoncé Knowles and Jay-Z and model/actor Rosie Huntington-Whiteley and actor Jason Statham.

Around the turn of the 20th century, the general preference was for international above local personalities in the South African weeklies. Yet it could be argued that a retreat from 'bad behaviour and bad skin' has now brought about a change. It seems a focus away from scandal has ensured the 'collaboration' of local personalities in terms of being represented and allowing access to their private lives and thus facilitated an increase in local content. It is important to note that, while international entertainers, sportspeople and other personalities certainly continue to have a strong presence in South African weeklies, there are increasing numbers of stories on local musicians, actors and the like. *Huisgenoot*, *YOU* and *Drum* each have growing regular weekly sections exclusively devoted to local personalities and have started featuring locals on the cover more than just occasionally, and almost all of the entertainment personalities featured in *Move!* are South African.

Continuing the tradition first started by the fanzines, the magazines today, both in South

[134] De Wet, Nici (compiler), "*It's getting serious!*", *YOU*, 23 February 2017.
[135] Atson, Lara, *"'n Amperse ramp – toe liefde", Huisgenoot*, 23 February 2017.

Africa and internationally, continue to constantly juxtapose elements of the 'ordinary and the extraordinary' in their coverage. In the *Huisgenoot* story on the Parnells, for instance, their ordinariness comes to the fore in anecdotes detailing how unprepared they were for daily domestic life; they both married out of their apparently relatively conservative Muslim parental homes and had to familiarise themselves with household duties such as buying electricity and cooking. A photograph of the couple at home shows, according to the caption, "*the cricket star making a smoothie*". Yet there remains a sense of the extraordinary also, at least in terms of lifestyle and consumption. Aisha admitted to being "*so scared*" alone in their "*big house*" when Wayne was away playing cricket in the West Indies four days after their wedding, so she immediately flew to be with him. The copy also makes reference to their "*Instagram life*", which is visually supported with photographs of Wayne's large collection of sneakers and Aisha's "*stylish wardrobe*". "*Wayne […] sit self nie 'n modevoet verkeerd nie. Sy klerekas kreun behoorlik*", the article notes (Wayne […] does not put a fashionable foot out of place. His wardrobe is literally groaning).

However, stories documenting romantic heartbreak and relationships falling apart, such as coverage of Brad Pitt looking gaunt after his split from second wife, Angelina Jolie, also abound. With the focus again moving away from the fairy tale and back towards heartbreak and hardship, as Sternheimer (2011), amongst others, have argued, this kind of coverage can be said to surface the *Emerging Celebrity* that was dominant in weekly entertainment magazines in the late 20th century. Some of the stories falling into this category have a sensational quality about them; the exclusive *Drum* cover story about "*the fight, the separate bedrooms and money troubles*" that characterised local Muthodi Neshehe's recent divorce after thirteen years of marriage is a good example here.[136]

5.2 Drawing the line at 'real' illness

Joost van der Westhuizen was a true hybrid figure, emerging, via weekly magazine coverage, alternately as a Hero, a *Star*, an *Emerging Celebrity* and a *Celebrity Proper*. But in general, the *Celebrity Proper* seems to be waning in weekly coverage. This is because there seems to be dwindling coverage of transgression, a distinctive feature of the *Celebrity Proper*, especially those transgressions that could have tragic or serious consequences.

This is one of the reasons the posthumous Joost coverage is interesting in an attempt to capture the current understanding of fame in South Africa. The story arc around the video

[136] Mpapu, Hopewell, *"Our marriage is on the rocks"*, *Drum*, 13 April 2017.

scandal that surfaced Joost as a *Celebrity Proper* in his lifetime was either omitted completely in the posthumous coverage (in *People*) or could be said to have supported the Hero more than the *Celebrity Proper*. The *Huisgenoot* and *YOU* tributes, for instance, framed the scandal in the religious mode of confession, absolution and redemption, and essentially surfaced Joost as setting an example for others to follow.

There was no dedicated focus on his peccadilloes in these two magazines' tribute issues; rather, the video scandal was buried in a chronological timeline article on his love life that showed glamorous and happy photographs of him with his first and second wives and children. Importantly, there was no visual evidence of the video exposé or photographs of the stripper who secretly filmed the tryst or the women with whom he is alleged, in the copy, to have had affairs. This article is entitled "*Love, marriage & scandal*" in *YOU*. And despite including roughly the same detail in its equivalent article inside, *Huisgenoot* is, however, careful to avoid reference to the scandal in its header/title, which reads, "*Die liefdes in Joost se lewe*" (The loves of Joost's life). Moreover, *Huisgenoot* also avoids any mention of its scandal coverage on the outside front cover of its tribute issue, despite its sister magazine doing so. Moreover, importantly, despite mentioning how he "*had the girls gasping for breath*", the two magazines do not represent Joost's impropriety as being 'sexy'.

On the contrary, and crucially, I argue that coverage of his infidelity here emphasises the fact that he actually confessed his wrongdoing. The *Huisgenoot* article on Joost's romantic history (but not its equivalent in *YOU*) even concludes with a religious reference to his coming clean before God and being in a position to go to heaven when he dies. The article notes how he remembered telling his son, Jordan, after his MND diagnosis, "*Dadda gaan dalk nou na Liewe Jesus toe*" (Daddy might be going to Jesus now).

By emphasising Joost's confession and apology to his wife and his fans, *YOU* and *Huisgenoot* coverage seemed to sketch Joost as an example for his honesty and coming clean. *People*'s tribute coverage avoids all drugs and sex references but does seem to hint at misjudgement and remorse in the prominent paragraph linking headline ("*The legend of a warrior*") to body copy of the inside article: "*An extraordinary life filled with the achievements, the mistakes, the regrets, the trials and the tributes that come with being human*". There is, again, a definite sense of confession in the only paragraph in this *People* article appearing to detail the traits Joost was apparently criticised for in his lifetime. The article quotes an old interview with the player in which he noted, "*There were times in my career when people said I was arrogant, I only cared about myself. Now I know they were right. It is really about*

giving and caring for others", before it subtly seems to accept his confession and redeem him in the concluding remark: "*This legacy – one of caring for others and being a family man – is how Joost will be remembered*".

Significantly, the way the weekly magazines chose to approach the scandal story arc in their tributes, as well as the anecdotal evidence of audience resistance to representations of Joost the *Celebrity Proper*, appears to reflect a more general trend in terms of how fame is being negotiated in weekly magazines and also consumed by their readership at the moment.

This general notion concerns the *kind* of private-life behaviour that could in a sense be construed by the magazine as transgressive. More specifically, there seems to be a calculated move away from coverage of behaviour that could result in criminal or other prosecution but also, more often and more importantly, the kind of behaviour that, in extreme cases, could be linked to mental illness and result in institutionalisation and even in death. In other words, the magazines shied away from coverage that could potentially hint at a sense of tragedy.

heat, the medium in which the *Celebrity Proper* surfaced most convincingly, always struggled with the editorial approach to take with story arcs involving potentially criminal behaviour. It was, for instance, problematic for the magazine to cover the late pop singer Michael Jackson's (second) child molestation trial while remaining faithful to *heat*'s characteristic irreverent, tongue-in-cheek editorial style. But a general editorial stance could still be adopted to avoid coverage of entertainers' criminal or potentially criminal behaviour.

However, unlike story arcs involving criminality, which could merely be avoided, it became progressively more challenging to formulate a sustainable editorial approach towards *heat*'s trademark and thus unavoidable Celebrity-news story arcs, namely those that deliberately surfaced misbehaviour, when they had the potential to edge towards more serious subject matter. It could be surmised that this potential was exacerbated by the magazine's continuous contextualisation and analysis of these arcs through 'psychologisation', or, to use Nunn and Biressi's phrase, the "excavation of the [personality's] troubled self" and specifically its pursuit of a "therapeutic narrative" (Nunn & Biressi 2010: 53), with the term 'therapy' implying illness, treatment and cure.

heat's probing into even the smallest apparent shifts in the inner life of the entertainment personality was quite relentless. It was argued above that this contemplation of the details was partially due to the weekly publishing frequency and, compared to family and women's

magazines, for instance, the pressure to produce a sufficient volume of content exclusively focused on entertainment and showbusiness personalities to fill a minimum number of pages with compelling coverage on a weekly basis.

It is of utmost importance to note that the association of mental 'illness' with the notion of greatness or genius is a familiar one, especially in the context of the artist, another name by which entertainment personalities are commonly known. "[T]he popularity of narratives of mental illness […] indicates the continuing appeal of the 'tortured genius' stereotype in the modern world", Stephen Harper (2006: 314) writes. "Today, as in the Renaissance and Romantic periods, mental illness is a token of both public greatness and private vulnerability; the celebrity, that most visible of attractions, is always imperilled by mental illness".

Yet it could be argued that the surfacing of the notion of mental illness or reference to its possibility in magazine coverage of artists/entertainment personalities is a relatively recent phenomenon, which seems to have come about with the increased focus on transgressive private-life behaviour. Harper (2006) goes on to argue that the surfacing of 'mental illness' in 21st-century narratives of fame can be attributed to the way in which famous people have gradually come to be covered in the media. Specifically, his argument seems to refer to how the representation of famous people continues to rely on interpretations of the so-called 'ordinary-extraordinary paradox'. This phrase was first associated with the Hollywood 'star system', and a constant attempt to present an ever more authentic private life:

> The association of celebrity and mental illness […] can be understood in the context of the postmodern inclination to 'have it both ways' – to offer glamorized images or values together with their reversal, critique or flipside. In today's postmodern media, the 'appearance' and 'reality' of celebrity (both equally constructed of course) are presented *simultaneously* […] The mental illness of celebrities in contemporary media culture reveals the 'truth' about the celebrity concerned, reminding 'ordinary people' […] of what celebrities are 'really like' in a way that does not contradict or undermine their star status. More generally, this seemingly double structuring of the mentally ill media celebrity as both a private and a public being, is typical of a postmodern media culture which offers audiences spectacles of celebrity, while at the same time unmasking them. (Harper 2006:321, original emphasis retained)

In the case of *heat*, this 'unmasking' or revelation of mental illness, or at least the allusion to behaviour that might indicate its possibility, seemed to become irreconcilable with this

magazine's trademark stylistic conventions of irony and satire. Often suggested by behaviour that could be construed as deviant, the idea of mental illness, even if it was only hinted at and not even an officially publicised diagnosis, seemed to elicit feelings that became irreconcilable with the humour and glamour that had become necessary for a Celebrity magazine such as *heat* to ensure and retain reader interest. This may be one of the main reasons why the local edition of *heat* closed down. The closure (in 2015) marked the end of the weekly magazine devoted exclusively to Celebrity news here in South Africa and, perhaps in a certain sense, the beginning of the disappearance, at least on the local landscape, of the *Celebrity Proper*. Minette Ferreira, the head of Media24's (*heat* parent's company) weekly magazine division at the time, seemed to acknowledge as much. In the statement announcing the magazine's closure, she commented that: "[I]nternational and local trends show that celebrity-only print titles are in decline. Many of our print titles have excellent celebrity content and we believe *heat* readers will migrate to incredibly powerful brands such as *YOU* and *Grazia*" (*TMO Reporter* 2015).

Women's magazine *Grazia* is clear in its equally strong focus on fashion/beauty as well as entertainment-personality news, and subsequently avoids content that focuses on the 'dark side'; in fact, the editorial ethos guiding the selection of personalities and particular story arcs to cover is one of 'triumph over tragedy', so if there is allusion to the tragic, it is merely in preparation for the triumphant.[137] *Grazia*'s photographic selection and editing can also be said to be strongly informed by a combination of its preference for stories emphasising overcoming hardship and its status as a fashion magazine, so even if there is an indication of a personality going through a tough time in her private life in the copy, the accompanying photographs will still be selected primarily for their sartorial appeal.

In terms of its exclusive focus on glamour and triumph narratives, and its general avoidance of the potentially dark and tragic, *Grazia* is, in a sense, the antithesis to *heat*. But *heat*'s other competitors on the local landscape (*Huisgenoot*, *YOU*, *People*, *Drum* and *Move!*) could all be said to have carried some content that surfaces the *Celebrity Proper* during *heat* SA's existence. However, following *heat*'s closure, the *Celebrity Proper* has also slowly started disappearing from the magazines that survived *heat* SA.

In particular, there has been decidedly less emphasis on the notion of the problematic, and this word is used in a broad sense here to encompass both the physical and the

[137] This ethos was relayed by *Grazia*'s international division at a 2012 training session for staff of the South African franchise, which I attended since I was part of the launch team.

psychological. My argument is that this dwindling coverage specifically concerns the kind of behaviour, or supposed misbehaviour, that seems to veer towards darkness when it is psychologically contextualised in a kind of approach that became common and even expected of weekly magazines in the very early years of the 21st century.

Of all the local weekly magazines that survived *heat*, *Move!* is the main one that continues to have a strong focus on scandal content when it comes to coverage of the private lives of entertainment personalities. The scandals in *Move!* are overwhelmingly also of a sexual nature, which seems to fit into the wider trend in magazines that Posel (2005) identifies, specifically amongst those with a young black women readership: "open any magazine with a largely young black readership and you are bound to find one or more articles on sex […] Much of this is relatively new – party because of the recently expanding magazine business […] but also as a sign of the newly assertive prominence of sexuality as style on the cultural agenda" (Posel 2005: 132).

However, while this is true, *Move!*'s scandal (sex and otherwise) stories are never supported by visual evidence and are generally reminiscent of tabloid newspapers rather than Celebrity magazines. The content is undetailed, relatively superficial, and there is hardly any sustained engagement with the personalities' inner lives. And on the rare occasions where serious transgression or scandal is suggested, such as with the Brickz trial[138] or the Thembi Nyandeni sex tape[139] referenced above, *Move!* seems to break away from the coverage that surfaced the *Celebrity Proper* figure. I make specific reference to *Move!* here, as I see the magazine as an important example of in its specific appropriation of the global trend of a shift away from serious transgression. The element of exposure that characterised *Celebrity Proper* coverage seems absent in *Move!*. The magazine for instance did not 'break' either the Brickz or the Thembi Nyandeni stories; they merely reported on the court proceedings in the case of the former and seemingly gave the actor a chance to defend herself against already known allegations in latter story. The Brickz article has as its primary focus the kwaito singer and his wife's "*unusual sexual relationship*"; the criminal aspect of the story, namely that these details of the couple's private sex-life came to light during his four-year rape trial, is mentioned but not prominently; it is buried in the body text of the story. In other words, *Move!* can be said to be shifting away from the "exposé gear" that Celebrity coverage became known for, as Gamson (2001: 270) argues. The tabloid influence is obvious, in that *Move!* readers are instructed that the story about the Ndlovus' sex life is 'shocking', with this

[138] Mdakane, Bongani, "*Brickz's wife happy to share him*", *Move!*, 17 May 2017.
[139] Zenoyise, John, "*Isibaya actress fed-up of sex tape*", *Move!*, 17 May 2017.

very word appearing no fewer than six times in the one-page article, despite it also being mentioned that sex between the spouses and the other parties partaking of their threesomes was consensual. This story has the potential to surface both Brickz and, given *Move!*'s self-branding as a women's magazine, especially his wife, Nqobile, as *Celebrity Proper* figures. Yet, because the coverage does not move beyond the superficial details of sexual acts, it may fail to engage the reader's empathy, and consequently, the appeal of the story and the personalities themselves cannot be guaranteed. As has been argued, even the *Celebrity Proper* figure needs to have some element of appeal, whether it be despite, or on account of, the transgression, in order to sustain reader interest. Importantly, there also seems to be a turn away, in *Move!*, from the exposure of the psyche of the supposedly transgressive personality, which is a feature of *Celebrity Proper* coverage. *Move!* seems to have adapted, to some extent, a global shift, presumably to appeal to its aspiring middle class black readership.

Perhaps in part because the other weekly magazines that survived *heat*, all of them family titles, are seemingly generally moving away from coverage that could potentially surface extremely troubled famous figures, there is no longer need for *heat*'s trademark satire- and irony-filled style. I personally find that, without that satirical element, weekly magazine content on showbusiness personalities is quite 'straight', lacks irreverence and is, generally, fairly bland and boring. Former British soccer captain David Beckham's leaked e-mail 'scandal' covered in *Huisgenoot* and *YOU*, for instance,[140] offered what seems like a perfect opportunity for a satirical take, but the article merely notes, in a very businesslike manner with the careful use of asterisks in the potentially offensive expletive, how David has "*been accused of using his charity work to curry favour for a knighthood. In one message to his publicist he allegedly calls the committee who decides who gets the honours bestowed by Queen Elizabeth a 'bunch of c***s' after they failed to knight him in 2013 amid concerns over his tax affairs*". In its equivalent article,[141] the even more careful and conservative *Huisgenoot* entirely omits the obscenity, just referring to David "*apparently offending the committee*" ([…] *het hy glo die komitee beledig* […]). The Afrikaans magazine also interestingly opts for the word 'drama' in the title of this snippet in showbusiness personality section, whereas *YOU* uses the word 'scandal'.

The 'scandal' branding of this Beckham story by *YOU* (and the less salacious 'drama' branding by *Huisgenoot*) is interesting for this discussion of the *Figure Now*. This is because,

[140] "*10 things we've learnt from Becks' email scandal*", *YOU*, 23 February 2017.
[141] "*10 dinge wat ons nou weet oor Becks se e-posdrama*", *Huisgenoot*, 23 February 2017.

compared to the scandals that were regularly covered by *heat*, these leaked emails seem so trivial; they can perhaps be said to be 'rude', but hardly transgressive. The 'exposé' of David's failed attempts at being knighted seems even more trivial when one considers that he is in actual fact no stranger to 'real' misbehaviour. He was, for instance, widely covered for his alleged infidelity, with this story arc dominating specifically weekly Celebrity magazines in the first decade of the 21st century. During this time, *heat* UK's sales were said to spike every time the Beckhams were on the cover. So this rather dry and bland snippet on the failed attempts at a knighthood by the former English football captain, who a decade before had been widely covered, with photographic evidence, for his alleged philandering, can be said to be a good illustration of how the *Celebrity Proper* has started fading from coverage, to be replaced, it seems, by a purportedly less conflicted and troubled personality with little potential for darkness, tragedy and mental illness.

On the international magazine landscape also, there seems to have been a retreat from story arcs that could potentially be seen as too dark. Former *heat* UK editor Mark Frith, who is credited with being instrumental in establishing the magazine's original editorial formula, already seemed to indicate as far back as 2008 that this formula, and specifically its dedicated focus on transgression, had a finite shelf life. In his memoirs, he recalls the day, in early January 2008, when the idea of resignation first occurred to him: "I got into the office […] this morning to be confronted by two of the darkest, most depressing celebrity stories we've ever been found to cover." He later sits at his desk:

> staring at the screen thinking to myself: what the hell happened to the fun world of celebrity? Where did it go? And when, exactly, did it go? Did it go with Kate [Moss] and Pete's [Doherty] dark, dysfunctional relationship and very public drug-taking? Did it go with Amy Winehouse (and her husband) engaging in brutal physical fights in hotel rooms and her spilling blood on a child's ballet shoes? Did it go with Britney [Spears]? (Frith 2008: 333).

And later, while explaining his resignation to the publishers of the magazine, Frith recalls thinking that, "As much as I love the celebrity world, it had, for me, become terribly dark over the last few months. I […] was fed up of seeing pictures of tormented famous people. The stars I had come to know and love had either moved on or were becoming increasingly distressed" (Frith 2008: 333).

Despite Frith's resignation, *heat* UK survives. Yet, crucially, also with markedly less photographic evidence and a seemingly diminishing focus on physical imperfection and

scandal, and instead, an apparent preference for coverage surfacing the *Emerging Celebrity* rather than the *Celebrity Proper*. In the weeks while I wrote this present chapter, there were, for instance, main cover stories about showbusiness babies (those of Beyoncé Knowles, British singer and television personality Cheryl Fernandez-Versini and Jennifer Aniston), relationships (Khloé Kardashian's secret wedding, marriage woes for Jennifer Aniston and Justin Theroux, Kim Kardashian and Kanye West and Victoria and David Beckham) and break-ups (Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie and Katy Perry and Orlando Bloom).

I came to the same conclusion after seeing similar articles (the aftermath of the Pitt-Jolie divorce, the Perry-Bloom break-up, an alleged new relationship between Latina pop singer Jennifer Lopez and baseball player Alex Rodriguez) appearing during the same time period in *US Weekly*, arguably the leading US magazine to surface the *Established Celebrity* in the early years of the new millennium.

The *US Weekly* on shelf at the time[142] had British television personality and singer Kelly Osbourne as its main cover story, with exclusive "excerpts from her new memoir", *There Is No F*cking Secret: Letters From a Badass Bitch*. The expressive, expletive title of the memoir admittedly seems to indicate the potential of it surfacing Kelly as a *Celebrity Proper*, and so does *US Weekly*'s tabloid-tradition all-uppercase main cover line "*MY LIFE AS AN ADDICT*" in bright canary yellow. Yet if one looks just a little closer, the figure that emerges in the magazine's representation is more like a *Star*, with perhaps, at least in terms of her overcoming her addiction, even some subtle references to the triumphant. There is, for instance, no indication of drug addiction or any visible after-effects in the glamorous and stylised studio-shot portrait photograph (as opposed to candid street-style or paparazzi-type) of Kelly with bright fuchsia lips *US Weekly* selected for its main cover image. Her trademark lilac-dyed hair is tucked behind her one ear, revealing a dangling cross earring, which can certainly be read as an understated yet deliberate visual reminder of religion in what is essentially a promotion of this latest 'confessional', the "*TELL-ALL BOOK*", as the *US Weekly* cover brands it. And while she arguably appears as a *Star* in the photograph selected for the cover, in terms of what the magazine selects to focus on from the memoir, she seems to surface not as a *Celebrity Proper* kind of painkiller addict but as a brave survivor of her addiction, despite purportedly adverse circumstances such as an enabling, recovering-addict father and a mother who had been diagnosed with cancer.

These examples from the biggest international weekly magazines illustrate that the local SA

[142] *US Weekly*, 17 April 2017.

coverage slots into a seemingly international trend. It appears as if there is a shift in terms of editorial selection, of both personalities and story arcs to be considered, to allow for a continuation of psychological contextualisation in the coverage, which has become a key characteristic of weekly showbusiness journalism, while carefully avoiding movement too close to the tragic and pathological in the process. Here we are again looking at the key questions of *who* gets selected for inclusion and *what* they are covered for. There appears to be a sense of editorial selection, of personalities and story arcs alike, becoming ever more discerning; the preference is still largely for entertainment personalities who are newsworthy, visible in public and have some glamour. In addition, there is a continued focus on newsy story arcs that include elements of 'flaw'. These story arcs revealing what is presented as misbehaviour appear to be selected for offering sufficient scope to explore the depths of the entertainment personality's soul, or as Nunn and Biressi (2010: 53) write, a kind of "delving beneath the surface of the celebrity's persona". Yet, crucially, editorial selection appears to have become increasingly sensitive to stories that have the potential to reveal sorrow, loss and intense inner conflict and suffering when this "delving" is done in the reporting. These storylines, especially if they offer very little or nothing in the way of potential for triumph over the tragedy or redemption of any kind for the personality involved, seem to be generally avoided in Celebrity journalism now.

5.3 The Hero returns, but not in epic form

Story arcs that have an element of triumph over one's own circumstances, of course, open up the possibility for the return of the heroic to magazine coverage. And as Celebrity coverage diminishes, as seems to be the case, the possibility for the heroic to return is further enhanced. After all, the 'perfect' Hero and the 'imperfect' Celebrity are two extremes or prototypes in the trajectory, and the one's disappearance opens the possibility for the other's re-appearance or return. As has been noted before, post-Celebrity fame seems to be based on a hybrid of characteristics from the three main categories in the trajectory proposed here, and while elements of successive understandings, such as the Hero and the *Star*, or the *Star* and the Celebrity, seem able to comfortably co-exist or co-appear in the coverage, the same can, however, not be said for the Hero and the *Celebrity Proper* figures, the two extremes or prototypes. In other words, an element of the heroic returns as the focus of coverage seemingly shifts away, somewhat, from entertainers looking less than perfect and behaving badly; moreover, if these elements are present, the emphasis is increasingly on triumphing over the temptations brought about through wealth

and success, or 'conquering those demons'.

But it is important to note that with the *Epic Hero* figure of early 20th-century coverage, there was a distinct sense of the externality of these 'demons'. The challenges were external. For instance, in the *Huisgenoot* coverage of the time, these challenges included conquering physical obstacles such as wild beasts and inclement weather, like the Voortrekkers did, and enemies on the battlefield, as was the case with heroes of the Anglo-Boer wars. The externality of the challenges is abundantly clear in the almost exclusive preference in the coverage for actions and behaviour in public, with the private and domestic realm being almost completely absent. Because there was almost no focus on the private life, let alone the inner conflict of the personalities covered, the kind of heroism that surfaced in the early 20th-century coverage could be said to be of the epic kind.

The general movement 'inwards', in coverage over the century, from the public to the private space and subsequently to the (conflicted) inner life, was a gradual one that could be understood in terms of a continuous attempt to reveal the real or true self. In order to demonstrate this inward movement, the argument pointed to how the coverage physically positioned these personalities exclusively in the public space at first and slowly crept into the private realm of their homes; from the outside space of the *stoep* of Paul Kruger's home in Pretoria in *Huisgenoot* in the early 20th century, through the kitchen of Barbra Streisand's Malibu home in *People* in the 1980s and finally to the inner sanctum of Paris Hilton's bedroom in *heat* in the early 2000s.

This turn to the within, in what might be seen as a constant pursuit of the true self, has also extended to the physical body, as layers have figuratively and literally been peeled away over time in order for us to, supposedly, get as close as possible to the essence of the famous figure. As Holmes and Redmond note, "The body of the star or the celebrity is key to this search for the 'truth' about the star or celebrity. If one can see the famous person stripped of all their finery, then one is supposedly getting unrestricted and unfiltered access to gaze at, and be intimate with, their primal state" (Holmes & Redmond 2006: 4).

It concerns, as Holmes and Redmond (2006) point out, the gaze, the 'seeing' and thus the visual. At the beginning of the 20th century there was very little visual representation of the physical body of the famous figure; in early *Huisgenoot* there were, for instance, 'famous faces', or small, predominantly head-and-shoulders portrait photographs accompanying copy-heavy profile articles. But then, as the century progressed, magazine coverage started including more visuals generally, revealing more than just heads and shoulders, and,

moreover, the 'gaze' also started moving inwards, beyond, underneath. With its male-dominated staff complement, *Drum* magazine in the 1950s certainly had a 'lad mag' editorial policy, but it arguably also tapped into a growing global trend in magazine coverage of famous people by, for instance, publishing photographs of Dorothy Masuka in her "*dainty underwear*" and emphasising her "*lovely legs*". And then, as we moved into the 21st century, magazines revealed more famous bodies and flesh, in coverage dominated by both sanctioned and unsanctioned photographs, with *heat* being one of the pioneers of the trend.

US singer and actor Bette Midler (2016) wittily captured the notion of this continuous movement towards the within well when she reacted to yet another nude self-portrait of reality television personality Kim Kardashian with the following comment on Twitter: "If Kim wants us to see a part of her we've never seen, she's gonna have to swallow the camera".

Yet, crucially, the most important apparent inward shift that seems to have taken place in magazine coverage over the 20th century has been that into the psyche, beyond the body, of the famous figure. If we look back to *Huisgenoot* editions of a century ago, for instance, there is very little if any indication of inner life; the poets, politicians and preachers were predominantly covered for their exemplary *actions*, and mostly those that happened in public. President of the then South African Republic Paul Kruger is celebrated in some of the early editions of this magazine title, for instance, for his "*fearlessness*" ("*onverschrokkenheid*") and determination "*in the face of danger*" ("*in 't gevaar*"), going along, at the tender age of thirteen years, on "*an expedition against the kaffer chief Selikats*" ("*op een ekspeditie tegen 't kafferhoofd Selikats*"). In no uncertain terms, the focus of the magazine at this point is not on the future statesman's emotions and inner feelings but on his actions or deeds: "*These deeds do not become a boy but a man*" ("*De daden van de knaap zijn de daden van een man*").[143] There is a general absence, in early *Huisgenoot*'s coverage of Afrikaner heroes, of pointers to an emotional dimension, let alone a publicised private life.

In contrast to the epic heroism that appeared to dominate early 20th-century coverage, the kind of heroism that gradually seems to start appearing, on select occasions, in 21st-century magazines can be said to be primarily concerned with overcoming the 'demons within', or the inner conflict of the psyche. If one reflects on the trajectory of fame as a whole, it could be said that the occasional coverage surfacing bravery and exemplary behaviour in the new millennium seems to be influenced by how the Celebrity and the *Star* were covered before,

[143] *"Levenschets President Kruger", De Huisgenoot*, May 1916.

i.e. inclusion of details of private-life behaviour but also, crucially, evidence of an inner or psychological life and a sense of conflict in this very realm.

Consequently, in the few new-millennium weekly-magazine stories surfacing courage, triumph, actions worth emulating and so forth one often finds allusions to confessing and overcoming inner conflict, which oftentimes arises from some form of transgression, and subsequent absolution and redemption. Nunn and Biressi (2010: 53, emphasis added) allude to the potential for disclosure to, "shift the story of celebrity transgression beyond initial shock, outrage and disdain and into a new field of self-inspection and *public reparation*".

Joost van der Westhuizen is again an interesting figure to return to in this part of the discussion. He is interesting because his heroism was, of course, explored in great detail in the hagiographic accounts, in the posthumous tribute issues of *Huisgenoot*, *YOU* and *People*. We saw lengthy accounts of his courage on the rugby field, in fighting MND and even using his own battle against the illness to benefit others in a similarly vulnerable position. Being celebrated for the achievements of your lifetime only posthumously is one of the defining characteristics of the heroism, so the fact that the weeklies only really focused on Joost the *Hero* in memoriam could also be said to contribute to the notion of the heroic surfacing in the representation.

However, Joost could never emerge a true *Epic Hero*, because the tribute issues included plenty of evidence not only of his private life but also of his emotional life, and specifically the inner turmoil he experienced following the 'sex and drugs' scandal story arc that emerged, in *heat*, in his lifetime. His admission to "*arrogance and caring only for himself at times*" (noted in the *People* tribute) and, moreover, his public confession to "*committing adultery*", having "*made many mistakes*" and being "*wrong*", and his apology "*to the people who believed in me. And who trusted me*" (here, the *YOU* and *Huisgenoot* tributes quote from his 2009 biography, *Joost: The Man In The Mirror*, by David Gemmell) point to introspection and provide an indication of Joost's inner life or psyche, and thus completely preclude him from emerging as an *Epic Hero*.

It should be noted that, by focusing on Joost's confession and apology, *Huisgenoot* and *YOU*'s posthumous coverage seems to support one of the familiar themes specific to the representation of sports personalities. Catherine Palmer (2016) and Whannel (2002), amongst others, call this theme "rise and redemption". In his book *Media Sports Stars: Masculinities and Moralities*, media-cultures scholar Gary Whannel (2002: 154) argues that this theme is a more recent addition to the two existing ones commonly associated

specifically with sports personalities, namely “rise to triumph” and “rise and fall”, while Palmer (2016: 170) argues that the “restitution narrative, while drawn from the sociology of health and illness, is by no means out of place in the […] ‘narrativisation’ of sporting lives”.

While the idea of ‘owning up’ or confessing might have specific meaning in terms of how sportspeople are represented and their lives ‘narrativised’, to use Palmer’s term, it has become a very important theme in the representation of famous personalities generally, not just sportspeople. Holmes and Redmond (2006: 289) write that disclosure is becoming “increasingly conventionalized within the parameters of celebrity discourse”. Susan van Zyl and James Sey (1996: 78) go even further by arguing that, “[C]onfessional practices of a mutated but recognisable form […] have come to permeate many unexpected aspects of contemporary writing and culture”.

The notion of confession seems to have added a first-person, first-hand dimension to showbusiness journalism, which, arguably more than any other form of journalism, came to rely on third-person accounts. Celebrity journalism has become closely associated with gossip, with the printed media in this industry even often colloquially referred to as ‘gossip magazines’. As is the case with gossip, first-person disclosure or confession also involves a sense of notoriety or at the very least impropriety (gossip is inseparable from scandal), and as with the other movements towards the within, it contributes an element of apparent truth or authenticity to the coverage, since the account is first-hand.

Underlying this trend of personal disclosure in entertainment journalism is the notion of transgressive behaviour (good and noble deeds are never ‘confessed’, but much more often witnessed and talked about, with much reverence) and specifically the so-called ‘sins of the flesh’. There is also, importantly, a sense of apparent introspection about this transgression and, certainly compared to the magazine coverage surfacing the *Epic Hero* a century before, a strong focus on thoughts and emotions, compared to actions, that permeates weekly magazine coverage of the *Figure Now*.

Conclusion

The post-Celebrity figure has been a difficult one to analyse and capture, not least because, as was argued earlier in this chapter, there is a sense of ‘dispersal’ about it. This is because individual characteristics that defined each one of the figures that came before in the trajectory appear to have dispersed into *The Figure Now*. This has meant that, unlike what has happened in the categorisation up until now, no clearly dominant type could be

identified. Instead, we see elements of the *Star* (glamour, for example) and the Celebrity (broken relationships and minor transgressions) re-emerging in coverage surfacing *The Figure Now*. In addition, it could be proposed defining characteristics of the *Emerging Celebrity* rather than the *Celebrity Proper* surface, as the latter figure is problematic in the sense of opening up the possibility of the tragic. With real mental illness, even just the potential of real mental illness, by and large being avoided by Celebrity magazines post-*heat*, the *Celebrity Proper*, then, seems to retreat.

And while elements of the Hero figure occasionally appear, the *Epic Hero* figure disappears entirely from coverage. In other words, no *Epic Hero* whatsoever and very little, or only faint echoes of the *Celebrity Proper* to be traced in coverage as we move towards the middle of the 21st century. The *Epic Hero* and the *Celebrity Proper*, the bookends of the trajectory discussed here, both the extreme ends, seem to have fallen away.

What is one then to make of a fairly commonly used phrase, which has been attributed to Michel Foucault, which holds that 'nothing falls completely out of the archive'? Nothing "disappears" from the archive "at the mercy of chance", Foucault (1969/1972: 129) writes. Yet here, the evidence gathered seems to suggest the contrary, meaning that while much remains, some things indeed seem to have 'fallen out of the archive', out of the trajectory of 20th century fame.

The apparent 'disappearance' or 'falling out' of certain forms of fame from the trajectory is one conclusion drawn here that allows for some critical engagement. Another is the general movement downward that was traced throughout the trajectory, from Paul Kruger and other "Great Men on Pedestals" (Henderson 2005: 38) and the *Stars* that shone so bright up on those big cinema screens down to magazine representation focused primarily on entertainers drunkenly falling down, over or otherwise 'from grace'. The Reflection chapter critically engages with two big themes to emerge here, namely the notion of descent and what seems to have 'fallen out' of the archive.

Concluding reflection

While examining the question of the famous figure in weekly magazines as we move into the third decade of the 21st century, the last chapter offered a way to reflect on the trajectory unfolding over the century as a whole. It is significant for me personally that Chapter 5 concluded with a contrast between the two figures outlining the outer edges of the trajectory traced here, namely the *Epic Hero* and the *Celebrity Proper*. It is also significant, I think, that it is with the emergence of the Celebrity figure that the task of identifying a dominant or characteristic understanding of fame begins to become increasingly difficult. The personal significance of the Celebrity, especially the *Celebrity Proper*, stems from the fact that it was this figure, one that I got to know intimately as a staff member working at *heat* SA in the first decade of the 21st century and one that is very different from that portrayed in the magazines read by one or even two generations before me, that gave rise to this project.

I was surprised and intrigued by the general popularity of the kind of figure and the content of the coverage that dominated our magazine. It was not, on reflection, the figure him- or herself that surprised me, nor even the distinctive *heat* style. What was surprising and intriguing was the focus of the coverage itself. The people *heat SA* covered clearly had to be visible and well-known. They had to be 'stars' of some kind, although in the usual sense of the term rather than the *Star* in the sense that it is used in Chapter 2. What surprised me was what it was about the Celebrity's actions or thoughts that prompted the coverage and its characteristic content. My interest was strongly linked to what it was that appeared to warrant the idea of the Celebrity in the first place, coverage that brought to the fore ingredients such as bodily imperfections, poor taste, bad behaviour and, increasingly, a troubled inner life. I was curious about how this, seemingly counterintuitive, focus came about and, most difficult of all, why.

The first step taken was to describe or document the changes that appeared in the coverage itself. But as the project grew and came to make an attempt to contribute to our understanding of changing forms of fame over a hundred years, it was clear that an explanation for these changes had to be pursued. I knew, perhaps from the start, that it was the content and style of the coverage itself that interested me, but it soon became clear that some sense of the socio-historical conditions that influenced the choices around who was covered and in what way was needed. It was important, especially in the early years, to convey a sense of the contextual factors that contributed to the particular forms of fame

dominating in South African magazines at certain periods. This meant providing contextual information in each of the five chapters in an attempt to show that each of the figures appearing in the trajectory could, not unexpectedly, be illuminated by the context at the time.

The dominance of the *Epic Hero* and the *Star*, the first two figures in the trajectory, could fairly easily, although clearly simplistically, be accounted for, especially in the first two magazines that were selected for analysis.

The figure described as an *Epic Hero* was, for instance, an obvious choice for early 20th century *Huisgenoot*, a magazine founded in 1916 and employed as one of the official media vehicles for establishing Afrikaans as an independent language and as a mouthpiece of the Afrikaner-nationalist project of the period. The *Huisgenoot* readership was assumed to identify strongly with a national ideal and the figure that embodied that ideal. The Hero figure arguably also worked particularly well in a range of magazines in South Africa and on the international landscape. At the time, magazines generally adopted what Peterson (1956: 209–210) called a "missionary" tone, and one of the obvious ways of maintaining the broad aim of promoting what was considered to be ideal was to cover, in unashamedly idealising ways, those who could be viewed in this light.

Thirty-five years on from the launch of *Huisgenoot*, the *Star* figure dominated in early issues of *Drum* magazine. As in the case of the *Epic Hero* in early *Huisgenoot*, the reasons for the prevalence of the *Star* figure in 1950s *Drum* can be identified and localised briefly without doing a serious disservice to the complexities of the period. The *Star* formula, produced as part of the marketing mechanism of the Hollywood film industry in the first half of the 20th century and primarily circulated in the medium of the fan magazine or 'fanzine', could be imported into *Drum* and applied to local entertainers. The appeal of the idealised *Star* in 1950s *Drum* could also be understood in terms of the gradually shifting function of a number of magazines from primarily providing guidance and advice to providing entertainment for their readers. For black South Africans under apartheid, magazines themselves did not merely provide entertainment but also "plausible alternative realities" (Laden 1997: 125) that were markedly better than their existing one.

While it was possible to provide, admittedly in very broad strokes, a sense of the role of factors in South Africa that might explain the context allowing for the emergence of the *Star* in 1950s *Drum* and the *Epic Hero* in early 20th century *Huisgenoot*, when the Celebrity figure (be it in the *Emerging* or *Proper* form) dominated towards the end of the century, it became

increasingly difficult to provide contextualisation of this kind. South African magazines, as was the case in many popular English-language print media, responded to an ever-more-closely connected world, the world Marshall McLuhan famously described as a 'global village' (McLuhan 1962, 1964). Even while the South Africa faced growing global isolation because of its racist apartheid policy, in the latter half of the 20th century, the Western world and its media products, including magazines and films, had a visible influence on the country. As democracy dawned in the country, international exposure of many kinds grew exponentially.

The emergence of the Celebrity figure in local publications must, in other words, largely be understood in the context of the global. Any attempt to address the question as to why the Celebrity became a dominant figure in magazines around the turn of the 20th century in South Africa can only be explained on the international level, taking into account the global proliferation of the media themselves, which were also often characterised by having global reach, not least in terms of international editions of magazines.

The global influence on the local emergence of Celebrity is undeniable, but it does not explain why this figure takes the form it does, or the substantial shift that has apparently taken place in what makes a person warrant representation, accompanied by a particular form of coverage in magazines in South Africa and in many Western countries. It is clear, as I have attempted to argue here, that there has been noticeable change over the century discussed as to what it is that makes a person representation-worthy. We seem to have moved away from covering exemplary people at their best to those whose achievements were, and are still not, easily idealised in traditional terms to a situation in which the famous figure's less-than-ideal moments are the ones that garner the most attention.

Although what could be called 'warranted' fame, and the success and the glamour that accompanies it, still needs to be present, this ingredient is, as it were, backgrounded. The Celebrity is represented not as larger than life but as more life-like, perhaps: as wild, extravagant and self indulgent on the one hand but also as unhappy and conflicted on the other. In other words, it seems (although probably less so in the case of South African personalities at present) representation-worthiness itself has shifted over a longer time and at another level.

In addition there is the related question of why this shift is one in which the space for the *Epic Hero*, and the *Celebrity Proper* appears to be closing. However, the apparent disappearance of the *Epic Hero*, and to some extent the *Celebrity Proper*, does not suggest

that elements of the heroic or the kind of treatment characteristic of the Celebrity disappear from coverage altogether. The well-known adage that 'nothing falls out of the archive', which was first referred to in Chapter 5 and has been attributed to Foucault, still rings true. While the outer edges, the *Epic Hero* and the *Celebrity Proper*, largely disappear, *Stars* and Celebrities, to use these words as general or common descriptions, do not – in essence these two figures have staying power.

What explains this staying power, on one level at least, is the constant 'surveillance' by the paparazzi and, more importantly in the case of the Celebrity, what this surveillance hopes and aims to capture in visual form. And this is where Foucault surfaces once more, and in the literature of the celebrity-studies discipline itself. This literature refers to Foucault's work that, in turn, refers to Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon (Foucault 1975). In a discussion devoted to the architecture of a structure characterised by a central observation tower, Foucault speaks of a design aimed at constant surveillance and, crucially, the observation of the many by the few. While the Panopticon may actually take architectural form, the observations the metaphorical Panopticon makes possible range from physical measurements and assessments to the results of psychological tests, resulting in case histories.

There are, however, obvious differences between the constant surveillance of prisoners in the prison yard and that to which celebrities are subjected. Crucially, these concern *who* it is that is 'constantly visible'. In *The Media and Modernity*, Thompson (1995) alludes to one distinction when he argues that the Panopticon is built on the premise of the few in power observing the powerless, whereas in the world of Celebrity, surveillance is of the select few 'powerful' ones, the rich and famous, by the many, the wandering documenters, the paparazzi with their cameras.

But those being subject to constant visibility by means of the Panopticon are also in other respects very different from the Celebrity. Foucault's subjects in the case of *Discipline and Punish* (1975) are prisoners, but those subjected to surveillance come to include the inhabitants of many closed institutions such as prisons, hospitals, schools and psychiatric wards. The deviant, the sick and the defiant young seem very different from the apparently free, glamorous and successful people we call Celebrities. But, and this is the crucial point, with panopticism those observed are not just "*constantly visible*", they are also "*perfectly individualized"* (Foucault 1975/1977: 200, emphasis added). And when one considers the

processes involved in this 'perfect individualisation' by way of seemingly unending surveillance, the Celebrity and the prisoner do not seem that far removed from each other.

To return at this point to the bigger question driving this concluding reflection: what has been learnt from this, the unexpected, linking of the prisoner and the Celebrity by way of their common subjection to surveillance? If Foucault argues that individualisation is the outcome of this process, how does surveillance work? What is observed, and how is this individualisation achieved? In essence, for Foucault it is the ongoing documentation or recording of these observations, and the fact that they build a picture of what distinguishes this prisoner or patient from healthy people or good citizens that make the human sciences possible. In the case of *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault 1975), both criminology and, crucially here, psychology originate in the form of punishment the prison enacts. Taken together, prisons and other closed institutions reveal how things go wrong, and build our understanding of what it is to be human and the ills and the sins that flesh is heir to. To make a big, an inelegant, leap forward, to know the Celebrity is to know more about her beauty and her successes. And the paparazzi want and need to reveal more about her than the posed red-carpet or studio shot reveal and, in the case of *heat* at least, capturing the flash of cellulite, the drunken stumble and illegitimate kiss are prizes that pay and are worth paying for in long hours of waiting.

However difficult it might be to see Foucault casting light not only on the big picture, that of Disciplinary power, but also on details of this kind, a direct quotation, a passage impossible to paraphrase, might help. Perhaps it is possible to make a connection between the eighty-year period over which the "reversal of the axis of individualization" is observed in *Discipline and Punish* and the later hundred years over which the trajectory being discussed here unfolds. Referring to the emergence of Disciplinary power itself, Foucault notes that it marks:

> the moment when the reversal of the political axis of individualization – as one might call it – takes place. In certain societies […] it may be said that individualization is greatest where sovereignty is exercised and in the higher echelons of power. The more one possesses power or privilege, the more one is marked as an individual, by rituals, written accounts or visual reproductions. As power becomes more anonymous and more functional, those on whom it is exercised tend to be more strongly individualized; it is exercised by surveillance rather than ceremonies, by observation

> rather than commemorative accounts, by comparative measures that have the 'norm' as reference; by 'gaps' rather than by deeds. (Foucault 1975/1977: 192–193)

The phrase "commemorative accounts" and then the reference to "the norm" and to "gaps" are important here. But what is important for the attempt to find an explanatory context for the figure of the Celebrity worldwide is the fact that this passage raises the question of Disciplinary power by explicitly pointing to different forms of representation, to differences in the way different people are individualised in different periods in the history of the West, a history that, by way of colonisation, impacts on South Africa.

With Disciplinary power comes a new way of individualising focused not on the powerful and the exemplary but on those that display their 'pathologies': their weaknesses, their non-normative idiosyncrasies. We no longer treat perfections, successes and triumphs as the natural subject matter for representation. Those who drive our popular-media narratives today are not only worthy of coverage at their best and in their best moments but also, especially perhaps, in terms of their most unguarded, even those that could be considered to be their worst.

Is it possible that in the background, however far back in that background, might seem to be what, in celebrity studies itself, emerges as the idea of the fall of the "Great Men on a Pedestal", to recall Henderson's (2005) phrase.

President Kruger is covered as on a 'pedestal' quite literally: visual and textual references to his bust and statue were often portrayed in the commemorative coverage of the 'great' man, and this sense of elevation remains in the word 'star' itself. The original *Star* hailed from the world of the large-format and elevated-screen cinema. And Dolly Rathebe, in South Africa in the 1950s, was described as "*a spangled, glitter-bespattered star, up above the heavens so high*".

However once the Celebrity figure emerges in magazine coverage from the late 20th century onwards, there is a distinct sense of descent, and the image of a 'fall' is conjured up by changes in the coverage, in both style and content, from the still-extraordinary status of the *Star* to the more ordinary features of people in *People*.

But of all the figures in the trajectory traced here, the *Celebrity Proper* is perhaps best illuminated in terms of the wider context provided by Foucault's writing on "descending" individualisation.

In the passage quoted above, Foucault ends his account of the differences between the ascending and descending axis of individualisation and the generic forms that it is reflected in by way of an extraordinarily revealing example:

> And if from the early Middle Ages to the present day the 'adventure' is an account of individuality, the passage from the epic to the novel, from the noble deed to the secret singularity, from long exiles to the internal search for childhood, from combats to phantasies, it is also inscribed in the formation of a disciplinary society. The adventure of our childhood no longer finds expression in '*le bon petit Henri*', but in the misfortunes of 'little Hans'. (Foucault 1975/1977: 193–194)

The point and the phrases used to capture it here are revealing once more: the reference to "inscription" and "expression", to the "secret singularity", and the choice of a character in a fairy tale contrasted with one in a case history.

Good little Henry, the hero of a centuries-old French fairy tale who saves his mother by successfully completing a number of epic tasks, provides the perfect contrast to the phobic 'little Hans', the pseudonym Freud uses in the case study of his five-year-old patient Herbert Graf. Henry may be a miniature Hero, but even as a child he has the qualities of a Hero, an *Epic Hero* in fact, whereas Hans is a real boy with a psychological illness worthy of detailed exploration.

Without too much strain, I think, the shift from Henry to Hans can be likened to the one we witness in changing understandings of fame over the 20th century. From the *Epic Hero* through the fairy tale of the *Star* to the supposedly true-to-life, sometimes self-indulgent, world of the Celebrity, it is different from that of the unhappy, neurotic child, but the dangers of psychological illness become ever present with this shift.

Even if current magazine representation seems to be retreating from focusing on behaviour that could point to serious psychological illness, an element of the unhappy psychological is almost invariably still present in that world and something which contemporary magazine coverage seizes on when it can. Nunn and Biressi (2010: 53) use the phrase "excavation of the […] troubled self" to describe the typical psychological analysis of celebrity behaviour in the media, where the term "excavation" again evokes a sense of delving, digging and descent. Magazines continue to focus on the emotional life of the personalities they cover, and the contextualisation of this focus often overtly uses what they describe as the "tropes of therapy"(Nunn & Biressi, 2010: 53). Implicit, sometimes explicit, in this coverage is the idea of an inner life, one troubled and in turmoil, and in need of repair.

What is especially interesting, as the Celebrity flaws and transgressions are revealed, is that the allure that must be present is maintained, but compared to the *Star* and the *Epic Hero*, it is often backgrounded. Celebrity coverage offers multiple options on the level of both content and style, and it comes to include the 'appealing' and the 'appalling' elements; the physical beauty and the charms of the talented but, importantly, also what could be described as the s*chadenfreude* of revealed failings, both physical and, crucially, psychological. And it is these errors that are highlighted as distinguishing Celebrities from *Stars* and certainly from Heroes of the epic kind.

One of the striking things about this move to reveal what is apparently negative, but certainly less than ideal, is that of the Celebrity figure's relation to the publicity of this negative kind. In the face of this supposedly unflattering exposure, there seems to be an increasing tendency, almost a pressure, for Celebrities themselves to respond actively and on the same terms to this potentially damaging publicity. What surfaces in the coverage is that Celebrities can in some sense 'save' their reputations and, crucially, gain further media attention, if they confess their sins.

And it is to an understanding of this seeming paradox that Foucault comes to our aid once more by revealing how surveillance and confession, power and knowledge and, especially significant here, *self*-knowledge, function in the age of Disciplinary power. As King (2008) points out, Foucault's writing on 'avowal', or confession, is often cited in support of the argument that "contemporary "man" is a confessing animal" (King 2008: 115). But, as King (2008) also points out, today confession is also a form of power. It is one of the methods through which subjects are formed in modernity but also one in which the object (or, in this case, subject) of that power can exploit it. Confession can, as Redmond (2008: 110) adds, "authenticate, humanize, resurrect, extend and enrich" the Celebrity image. As a first-person acknowledgement, confession necessarily contributes to a sense of reality, of truthfulness and authenticity and, in this way, retrieves some of the damage that could come with exposure.

In Celebrity culture, confession no longer has the original religious connotation of sin in the Biblical sense, yet it continues to be coloured by the notion of fault and faltering. There is, in fact, the suggestion that entertainment personalities might be covered in weekly magazines in order to give readers a sense of their own 'power' (although not in the strong sense of the term) over the Celebrities by moving the rich and famous 'off the pedestal'. And in this, the magazines' efforts seem to have been successful. As Hermes (1995: 126) notes, regular

readers of Celebrity magazines report enjoying and gaining "a secret sense of power" over those covered in these revealing, exposing ways.

This sense of power is characterised by a deeper penetration of the private sphere of the entertainment personality than ever before: the privacy of the bedroom in the home, for instance, but, crucially, also the private thoughts or the inner psychological life.

This move to 'bedroom things' is related to the increased attention paid to the flesh. The secrets of those repressed desires, and the knowledge and self-knowledge of them are now crucial to identity. In terms of confession, sex has a privileged position in that it represents the revelation and exploration of that which is most secret. Sex may be an especially important type of transgression, one that garners special attention in terms of confession, but there is more to the idea of confession than its relation to sins and transgressions.

As Foucault points out in the introduction to the *History of Sexuality* (1976), in the 18th century there developed an 'immense verbosity' around sex. This includes specialised discourses of doctors and the interest in questions of population but also self-knowledge, introspection and the 'airing' of the troubled self in a secular mode. It does not concern "talking about the obligation to admit to violations of the laws of sex, as required by traditional penance," Foucault writes:

> but of the nearly infinite task of telling—telling oneself and another, as often as possible, everything that might concern the interplay of innumerable pleasures, sensations, and thoughts which, through the body and the soul, had some affinity with sex. (Foucault 1976/1981: 20)

This externalisation of "everything" regarding sex, both through the body and, crucially, the soul, is broadly understood to be the result of the emergence of psychological knowledge. Self-understanding and a shifting of the secrets of sexual desire into a position where they can be spoken about and understood is the defining characteristic of what have come, after Foucault, to be called the called 'psy'-industries: "All the sciences, analyses or practices employing the root 'psycho-' have their origin in [the] historical reversal of the procedures of individualization"(Foucault (1975/1977: 193).

And in tracing and characterising this reversal, Foucault is yet again concerned with questions of representation. In addition to the reversal marking the "passage from the noble deed to the secret singularity, from long exiles to the internal search for childhood, from combats to phantasies", he also speaks of a movement from the "the epic to the novel"

(Foucault 1975/1977: 193). In contrasting the epic with the novel in this passage about the "reversal of the procedures of individualization", Foucault appears to reveal that there is some kind of connection to be traced between the novel, the notion of descending procedures of individualisation and its connection to the psychological.

Earlier, in *The Father's No* (1971), Foucault prepared for an understanding of the entrance of this contradiction into our culture, in a phrase that seems extraordinarily relevant to the argument about changing forms of fame being advanced here: "The psychological dimension in our culture is the *negation* of epic perceptions" (Foucault, 1971/1989: 10). In other words, the wider role for psychology has come at the expense of epic perceptions, and my observations on the trajectory of fame would be arguably poorer for not considering this point made by Foucault about the uneasy, perhaps impossible, co-existence of the epic, which characterised early 20th-century magazine coverage, and the psychological, which could be said to cast light on what we both see and do not see in magazines now. Today there is nothing but the smallest space, if any at all, for a confessing Kruger, an epic Barack Obama or an entirely untroubled Britney Spears. And in South Africa, the truism that 'history repeats itself' in a period as short as a hundred years outlines in vivid terms the tension between epic perceptions and those expressing the dominance of the psychological in contemporary culture.

Bibliography

Adkins, Karen C. (2002). The real dirt: gossip and feminist epistemology. *Social Epistimology* 16(3): 215–232.

Alegi, Peter. (2004). *Laduma! Soccer, Politics and Society in South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg, SA: UKZN Press.

Allen, Lara. (2004). Music, film and gangsters in the Sophiatown imaginary: featuring Dolly Rathebe. *Scrutiny2 Issues in English Studies in Southern Africa* 9(1): 19–38.

Altman, Howard. (2010). Celebrity Culture: Are Americans Too Focused on Celebrities? In *Issues For Debate in Sociology: Selections from CQ Researcher*, Thousand Oaks, California, US: Pine Forge Press.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

Anderson, Perry. (2017). Passing the Baton. *New Left Review* 103, January–February 2017. Available from https://newleftreview.org/II/103/perry-anderson-passing-the-baton. (Accessed 15 December 2017.)

Anker, Willem. (2016). *Buys: 'n Grensroman.* Cape Town, SA: NB Publishers.

Ansell, Gwen. (2004). *Soweto Blues: Jazz, Popular Music and Politics in South Africa*. London, UK: Continuum.

Ansell, Gwen. (2007). Of Roots and Rhythm. In *Jazz, Blues & Swing: Six Decades of Music in South Africa*. Cape Town, SA: David Philip Publishers.

Ansell, Gwen. (2011). The Golden Years. *Drum: 60 Years of Drum*. Commemorative magazine. Cape Town, SA: Media24.

Arendt, Hannah (Ed.). (1968). *Illuminations: Walter Benjamin*. New York, US: Schocken Books.

Bailey, Jim. (1982). Letting the Genie out of the Bottle. In Angela Caccia (Ed.), *The Beat of Drum: The Rise of Africa*. Johannesburg, SA: *Drum*.

Baker, Sarah Jane. (2006). Celebrity gossip magazines and feminist and post-feminist theory: the impacts on female formation of body image created by celebrity weight depictions in *heat* and *Closer*. (Master's thesis, Cardiff University, UK.)

Balseiro, Isabel and Masilela, Ntongela (Eds.). (2003). *To Change Reels: Film and Film Culture in South Africa*. Detroit, Michigan, US: Wayne State University Press.

Barry, Elizabeth. (2008). Celebrity, cultural production and public life. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 11(3): 251–258.

Baudrillard, Jean. (2007). The Ecstacy of Communication. In Su Holmes and Sean Redmond (Eds.), *Stardom and Celebrity*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Boddy, Kasia. (2008). *Boxing: A Cultural History*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.

Bogdanovich, Peter. (2004). *Who the hell's in it: Portraits and Conversations*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.

Boorstin, Daniel. (1971). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York, US: Atheneum.

Botha, Martin (Ed.) (2007) *Marginal lives and painful pasts: South African cinema after apartheid.* Cape Town, SA: Genugtig!

Botha, Martin. (2012). *South African cinema 1895–2010*. Bristol, UK: Intellect.

Botha, Martin and Blignault, Johan. (1992). *Movies – moguls – mavericks: South African Cinema 1979–1991*. Cape Town, SA: Showdata.

Botha, Martin and Van Aswegen, Adri. (1992). *Images of South Africa: Alternative film*. Pretoria, SA: HSRC Press.

Braudy, Leo. (1986). *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and Its History*. New York, US: Oxford University Press.

Bull, Stephen. (2010). *Photography*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cashmore, Ellis. (2010). Buying Beyoncé. *Celebrity Studies* 1(2): 135–150.

Clowes, Lindsay. (2001). 'Are You Going to be MISS (or Mr) Africa?' Contesting Masculinity in *Drum* magazine 1951–1953. *Gender & History* 13(1): 1–20.

Cooper, Andrew F. (2007). Beyond Hollywood and the Boardroom: Celebrity Diplomacy. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 8(2): 125–132.

Couzens, Tim. (1985). *The New African: A Study of the Life and Work of H.I.E. Dhlomo*. Johannesburg, SA: Ravan Press.

Cowling, Lesley. (2016). Echoes of an African Drum: The Lost Literary Journalism of 1950s South Africa. *Literary Journalism Studies* 8(1): 9–32.

Currid-Halkett, Elizabeth. (2010). *Starstruck: The Business of Celebrity*. New York, US: Faber and Faber.

Davis, Peter. (1996). *In Darkest Hollywood: Exploring the Jungles of Cinema's South Africa*. Johannesburg, SA: Ravan Press.

Davis, Victor. (2002). The Father of Scandal. *British Journalism Review* 13(4): 74–80.

DeCordova, Richard. (1991). The Emergence of the Star System in America. In Christine Gledhill (Ed.), *Stardom: Industry of Desire*. London, UK and New York, US: Routledge.

Dixon, William Macneile. (1912). *English Epic and Heroic Poetry*. London, UK: JM Dent & Sons.

Dovey, Lindiwe and Impey, Angela. (2010). *African Jim*: sound, politics, and pleasure in early 'black' South African cinema. *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 22(1): 57–73.

Drake, Philip and Miah, Andy. (2010). The Cultural Politics of Celebrity. *Cultural Politics* 6(1): 49–64.

Driessens, Olivier. The celebritization of society and culture: Understanding the structural dynamics of celebrity culture. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 16(6): 641–657.

Driver, Dorothy. (1996). *Drum* magazine (1951–9) and the spatial configurations of gender. In Kate Darian-Smith, Liz Gunner and Sarah Nuttall (Eds.), *Text, theory, space: land, literature and history in South Africa and Australia*. London, UK and New York, US: Routledge.

Drucker, Susan J. (1994). The Mediated Sports Hero. In Susan J. Drucker and Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Drucker, Susan J. and Cathcart, Robert S. (1994). The Hero as a Communication Phenomenon. In Susan J. Drucker and Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Dunbar, Robin. (1996). *Grooming, Gossip and the Evolution of Language*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.

Dyer, Richard. (1991). Charisma. In Christine Gledhill (Ed.), *Stardom: Industry of Desire*. London, UK and New York, US: Routledge.

Dyer, Richard. (1979). *Stars*. London, UK: British Film Institute.

Ellis, John. (1982). *Visible Fictions*. New York, US: Routledge.

Epstein, Joseph. (2005). Celebrity Culture. *The Hedgehog Review* Spring 2005: 7–20.

Fairclough, Kirsty. (2008). Fame is a Losing Game: Celebrity Gossip Blogging, Bitch Culture and Postfeminism. *Genders* online journal issue 48. Available from https://www.colorado.edu/gendersarchive1998-2013/2008/10/01/fame-losing-game-celebrity-gossip-blogging-bitch-culture-and-postfeminism. (Accessed 2 March 2018.)

Fayer, Joan. (1994). Are Heroes Always Men? In Susan J. Drucker and Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Feasy, Rebecca. (2008). Reading *heat*: The meanings and pleasures of star fashions and celebrity gossip. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 22(5): 687–699.

Fenwick, Mac. (1996). 'Tough Guy, eh?': The Gangster-Figure in Drum. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 22(4): 617–632.

Foucault, Michel. (1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated from French by Alan Sheridan, 1972, New York, US: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. (1971). 'Le "non" du pere', in *Dits et Ecrits vol I*. Paris, France: Gallimard. Translated from French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon and published in James D. Faubion (Ed.), 1989, *Aesthetics, method and epistemology*, New York, US: The New Press. Available from https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~cavitch/pdf-library/Foucault_FathersNo.pdf. (Accessed 15 February 2017.)

Foucault, Michel. (1975). *Discipline and Punish*. Translated from French by Alan Sheridan, 1977, New York, US: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. (1976). *The History of Sexuality Volume One: An Introduction*. Translated from French by Robert Hurley, 1978, New York, US: Pantheon Books.

Frith, Mark. (2008). *The Celeb Diaries: The Sensational Inside Story of the Celebrity Decade.* London, UK: Ebury Press.

Froneman, Johannes. (2004). Dominante motiewe in die transformasie van *Huisgenoot*, 1916-2003. *Ecquid Novi* 25(1): 61–79.

Froneman, Johannes. (2011). The rise and demise of *Scope* magazine: A media-historical perspective. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies* 32(1): 49–65.

Gabler, Neal. (2001). Toward a New Definition of Celebrity. The Norman Lear Centertainment: Exploring Implications of the Convergence of Entertainment, Commerce, and Society. Available from https://learcenter.org/pdf/Gabler.pdf. (Accessed 23 January 2012.)

Gamson, Joshua. (2001). The Assembly Line of Greatness: Celebrity in Twentieth-Century America. In C. Lee Harrington and Denise D. Bielby (Eds.), *Popular Culture: Production and Consumption*. London, UK: Blackwell.

Gandhy, Behroze and Thomas, Rosie. (1991). Three Indian Film Stars. In Christine Gledhill (Ed.), *Stardom: Industry of Desire*. London, UK and New York, US: Routledge.

Geraghty, Christine. (2000). Re-examining stardom: questions of text, bodies and performance. In Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams (Eds.), *Reinventing Film Studies*. London, UK: Arnold.

Giliomee, Hermann. (2003). *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People*. London, UK: Hurst & Company.

Goodman, Robert F. (1994). Introduction. In Robert F. Goodman and Aharon Ben-Ze'ev (Eds.), *Good Gossip*. Lawrence, Kansas, US: University Press of Kansas.

Gready, Paul. (1990). The Sophiatown writers of the Fifties: The Unreal Reality of Their World. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 16(1): 139–164.

Gutsche, Thelma. (1972). *The History and Social Significance of Motion Pictures in South Africa 1895 – 1940*. Cape Town, SA: Howard Timmins.

Halverson, Stefanie K., Murphy, Susan Elaine and Riggio, Ronald E. (2004). Charismatic leadership in crisis situations: A Laboratory Investigation of Stress and Crisis. *Small Group Research* 35(5): 495–514.

Harmon, William and Holman, C. Hugh. (1999). *A Handbook to Literature*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, US: Prentice Hall.

Harper, Stephen. (2006). Madly Famous: Narratives of mental illness in celebrity culture. In Su Holmes and Sean Redmond (Eds.), *Framing Celebrity: New Directions in Celebrity Culture*. New York, US: Routledge.

Henderson, Amy. (2005). From Barnum to "bling-bling": the changing face of celebrity culture. *The Hedgehog Review* 7(1): 36–46.

Hermes, J. (1995). *Reading Women's Magazines*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Herriman, Nicholas. (2010). The Great Rumor Mill: Gossip, Mass Media, and the Ninja Fear. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 69(3): 723–748.

Hirschberg, Lynn. (2009). The Self-Manufacture of Megan Fox. *The New York Times Magazine*, November 11, 2009. Available from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/15/magazine/15Fox-t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0. (Accessed 5 November 2014.)

Hoggard, Liz. (2010). …and God created Angelina. *Independent*, 3 August 2010. Available from https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/features/and-god-created-angelina-2042355.html. (Accessed 27 September 2010.)

Holland, Margaret G. (1996). What's Wrong with Telling the Truth? An Analysis of Gossip. *American Philosophical Quarterly* 33(2): 197–209.

Holmes, Su. (2005). Off-guard, unkempt, unready: deconstructing contemporary celebrity in *heat* magazine. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 19 (1): 21–38.

Holmes, Su and Redmond, Sean. (2006). Introduction. In Su Holmes and Sean Redmond (Eds.), *Framing Celebrity: New Directions in Celebrity Culture.* New York, US: Routledge.

Howells, Richard. (2011). Heroes, saints and celebrities: the photograph as holy relic. *Celebrity Studies* 2(2): 112–130.

Hyslop, Jonathan. (2000). Why did Apartheid's supporters capitulate? 'Whiteness', class and consumption in urban South Africa, 1985-1995. *Society in Transition* 31(1): 36–44.

Inglis, Fred. (2010). *A Short History of Celebrity*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Iqani, Mehita. (2012). *Consumer Culture and the Media: Magazines in the Public Eye*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jermyn, Deborah. (2006). 'Bringing out the * in you': SJP, Carrie Bradshaw and the evolution of television stardom. In Sean Redmond and Su Holmes (Eds.), *Framing Celebrity: New Directions in Celebrity Culture*, London, UK: Routledge.

Joubert, Jurie Jacobus. (1983). Geskiedskrywing in *Die Huisgenoot*, 1923 – 1949. (Master's thesis, University of South Africa, 1983.)

Joubert, Marina. (2017). How an historic heart transplant created a celebrity scientist 50 years ago. *The Conversation*, November 29, 2017. Available from https://theconversation.com/how-an-historic-heart-transplant-created-a-celebrity-scientist-50-years-ago-88277. (Accessed 15 December 2017.)

Kellner, Douglas. (2009). Barack Obama and Celebrity Spectacle. *International Journal of Communication* 3: 715–741.

King, Barry. (2008). Stardom, celebrity and the para-confession. *Social Semiotics* 18(2): 115–132.

King, Barry. (2014). *Taking Fame to Market: On the Pre-History and Post-History of Hollywood Stardom*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kooistra, Paul. (1990). Criminals As Heroes: Linking Symbol to Structure. *Symbolic Interaction* 13(2): 217–239.

Labuschagne, E.J. (1949). The cultural historical significance of *Die Huisgenoot* up to June 1931. (Master's thesis, University of Pretoria, SA, 1949).

Laden, Sonja. (1997). Middle-class matters, or, how to keep whites whiter, colours brighter, and blacks beautiful. Critical Arts 11(1–2): 120–141.

Lai, Adrienne. (2006). Glitter and grain: Aura and authenticity in the celebrity photographs of Juergen Teller. In Su Holmes and Sean Redmond (Eds.), Framing Celebrity: New Directions in Celebrity Culture. New York, US: Routledge.

Leonard, Charles. (2006). Addicted to Tinseltown. *Mail & Guardian*, July 14 – 20, 2006. Available from https://mg.co.za/article/2006-07-17-addicted-to-tinseltown. (Accessed 13 September 2006.)

Le Roux, André I. and Fourie, Lilla. (1982). *Filmverlede – geskiedenis van die Afrikaanse speelfilm*. Pretoria, SA: UNISA.

Littler, Jo. (2004). Making fame ordinary: intimacy, reflexivity, and 'keeping it real'. *Mediactive* 2: 8–25.

Louw, P. Erik. (2004). *The Rise, Fall and Legacy of Apartheid*. Westport, US: Praeger/Greenwood.

Maingard, Jacqueline. (2007). *South African national cinema*. London, UK: Routledge.

Malan, Rian. (1991). *My Traitor's Heart*. London, UK: Vintage.

Manoim, Irwin Stanley. (1983). The Black Press 1945-1953 – the growth of the black mass media and their role as ideological disseminators. (Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, SA, 1983.)

Marshall, P. David. (1997). *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*. Minneapolis, Minnesota, US: University of Minnesota Press.

Marshall, P. David. (2010). The promotion and presentation of the self: celebrity as marker of presentational media. *Celebrity Studies* 1(1): 35–48.

Marwick, Alice. (2015). Instafame: Luxury Selfies in the Attention Economy. *Public Culture* 27(1): 137.

McLuhan, Marshall. (1962). *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

McLuhan, Marshall. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York, US: McGraw-Hill.

Merrill, John. (2005). Two faces of tabloidism. *Ecquid Novi*: *African Journalism Studies*, 26(2): 264.

Meyerowitz, Joshua. (1994). The Life and Death of Media Friends: New Genres of Intimacy and Mourning. In Susan J. Drucker and Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Mishra, Pankaj. (2017). This Poisonous Cult of Personality. *The New York Review of Books*, 1 December 2017. Available from http://www.nybooks.com/daily/2017/12/01/this-poisonous-cult-of-personality/. (Accessed 14 December 2017.)

Moodie, T. Dunbar. (1975). *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion*. Berkeley, California, US: University of California Press.

Morin, Edgar. (1960). *The Stars*. New York, US: Grove Press Inc.

Moss, Bettina. (2016). *Paris Match*: From weekly to the moment. *The Media Online*, September 27, 2016. Available from http://themediaonline.co.za/2016/09/paris-match-from-weekly-to-the-moment/. (Accessed 9 February 2017.)

Motjuwadi, Stanley. (1982). Kid Fix-Up. In Angela Caccia (Ed.), *The Beat of Drum: The Rise of Africa*. Johannesburg, SA: *Drum*.

Mphahlele, Es'kia. (1967). The Fabric of African Cultures. Available from https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/africa/1964-07-01/fabric-african-cultures. (Accessed 26 August 2015.)

Muller, Antoinette. (2017). Joost van der Westhuizen's life of two halves, bound together by tenacity. *Daily Maverick*, 06 February 2017. Available from https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-02-06-joost-van-der-westhuizens-life-of-two-halves-bound-together-by-tenacity. (Accessed 10 February 2017.)

Muller, C.F.J. (1990). *Sonop in die Suide: Geboorte en Groei van die Nasionale Pers 1915-1948*. Cape Town, SA: Nasionale Boekhandel Beperk.

Nairn, Tom. (1977). *The Break-up of Britain*. London, UK: New Left Books.

Nixon, Rob. (1993). *The devil in the black box: Ethnic nationalism, cultural imperialism and the outlawing of TV under apartheid*. Collected seminar papers, Institute of

Commonwealth Studies, 45: 120–137. Available from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/8766848.pdf. (Accessed 27 April 2012.)

Nixon, Rob. (1994). *Homelands, Hollywood and Harlem: South African Culture and the World Beyond*. New York, US and London, UK: Routledge.

Nunn, Heather and Biressi, Anita. (2010). "A trust betrayed": celebrity and the work of emotion, *Celebrity Studies* 1(1): 49–64.

Ogunnaike, Lola. (2006). Sex, Lawsuits and Celebrities Caught on Tape. *The New York Times*, March 19, 2006. Available from http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C07E6DB1E31F93AA25750C0A9609C8B63. (Accessed 5 November 2014.)

O'Meara, Dan. (1979). Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934 – 1948. (Doctoral thesis, University of Sussex, UK, 1979.)

Petersen, Anne Helen. (2010). Tells the Facts and Names the Names. Celebrity Gossip, Academic Style. Available from http://www.annehelenpetersen.com/writing/1805. (Accessed 4 November 2014.)

Petersen, Anne Helen. (2011). The Gossip Industry: Producing and Distributing Star Images, Celebrity Gossip, and Entertainment News 1910-2010. (Doctoral thesis, University of Texas at Austin, US, 2011.)

Petersen, Anne Helen. (2017). Charlize Theron Is Not Here To Make Friends. Buzzfeed, July 29, 2017. Available from https://www.buzzfeed.com/annehelenpetersen/charlize-theron-is-not-here-to-make-friends?utm_term=.ypn6G2Y3x#.ngzvAe21y. (Accessed 3 August 2017.)

Peterson, Theodore. (1956). *Magazines in the Twentieth Century*. Urbana, Illinois, US: The University of Illinois Press.

Posel, Deborah. (2005). Sex, death and the fate of the nation: reflections on the politicization of sexuality in post-apartheid South Africa. *Africa* 75(2): 125–153.

Pretorius, Jan Adriaan. (1973). Die ontwikkeling van die kortverhaal in Afrikaans soos weerspieël in 'Die Huisgenoot' van 1916 tot 1966. (Doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria, SA, 1973.)

Rahman, Momin. (2008). Jade's confession: racism and the dialectics of celebrity. *Social Semiotics* 18(2): 133–148.

Rauwerda, Antje M. (2007). Whitewashing *Drum* Magazine (1951–1959): Advertising Race and Gender. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 21(3): 393–404.

Redmond, Sean. (2006). Intimate Fame Everywhere. In Su Holmes and Sean Redmond (Eds.), *Framing Celebrity: New Directions in Celebrity Culture*. New York, US: Routledge.

Redmond, Sean. (2008). Pieces of me: celebrity confessional carnality. *Social Semiotics* 18(2): 149–161.

Redmond, Sean. (2010). Avatar Obama in the age of liquid celebrity. *Celebrity Studies* 1(1): 81–95.

Reeves, Jimmie L. (1988). Television Stardom: A Ritual of Social Typification and Individualization. In James W. Carey (Ed.), *Media, Myths and Narratives: Television and the Press*. Newbury Park, US: Sage Publications.

Rixon, Paul. (2011). The role of the British popular press in re-imagining American television celebrities for the British audience: the 1950s to the 1960s. *Celebrity Studies* 2(1): 44–55.

Rogers, Florence and Real, Michael. (1994). Theorizing Postmodern Stars: George Michael and Madonna. In Susan J. Drucker and Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Rojek, Chris. (2001). *Celebrity*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.

Rosnow, Ralph L. and Fine, Gary Alan. (1976). *Rumor and Gossip: The Social Psychology of Hearsay*. New York, US and Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company.

Russello, Gerald J. (2005). How New Journalism Became Old News: Book Review of Weingarten's *The Gang That Wouldn't Write Straight: Wolfe, Thompson, Didion, and the New Journalism Revolution*. *New York Sun*, 21 November 2005. Available from http://www.nysun.com/arts/how-new-journalism-became-old-news/23300/. (Accessed 3 February 2015.)

Saks, Lucia. (2010). *Cinema in a Democratic South Africa: The Race for Representation*. Bloomington, US: Indiana University Press.

Sampson, Anthony S. (2004). *Drum: The Making of a Magazine*. Johannesburg and Cape Town, SA: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Senft, Theresa M. (2015). In Hartley, John, Burgess, Jean & Bruns, Axel (Eds.), *A Companion to New Media Dynamics*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd 346–354

Schickel, Richard. (1985). *Intimate Strangers: The Culture of Celebrity*. New York, US: Doubleday & Co.

Slabbert, S.J.C. (1993). Women's language in three Afrikaans magazines: *Die Boerevrou* (1919-1931), *Die Huisgenoot* (1930-1940) and *Sarie Marais* (1949-1989). (Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, SA, 1993.)

Smith, Jacob. (2010). The Adventures of the Bridge Jumper. *Celebrity Studies* 1(1): 21–34.

Sochen, June. (1998). From Sophie Tucker to Barbra Streisand: Jewish Women Entertainers as Reformers. In Joyce Antler (Ed.), *Talking Back: Images of Jewish Women in American Popular Culture*, Brandeis Series in American Jewish History, Culture, and Life. Waltham/Boston, US: Brandeis.

Sparks, Allister. (1990). *The Mind of South Africa*. London, UK: Heinemann.

Staiger, Janet. (1991). Seeing Stars. In Christine Gledhill (Ed.), *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, London, UK: Routledge.

Stemmet, Jan-Ad. (2005). From nipples and nationalists to full frontal in the new South Africa: an abridged history of pornography and censorship in the old and new South Africa. *Communicatio* 31(2): 198–210.

Sternheimer, Karen. (2011). *Celebrity Culture and the American Dream*. New York: Routledge.

Strelitz, Larry. (2006). Towards a philosophy of African journalism. Paper presented at Highway Africa Conference on 12 September 2006 at Rhodes University in Grahamstown. Available from http://www.highwayafrica.ru.ac.za/presentations.cfm. (Accessed 17 May 2013.)

The Economist. (2002). Land of Hoped-for Glory. *The Economist*, September 26th, 2002. Available from https://www.economist.com/node/1353032. (Accessed 13 July 2010.)

The Economist. (2004). Star Power: Bonnie Fuller and the Feminist Case for Celebrity Journalism. *The Economist*, August 5th, 2004. Available from https://www.economist.com/node/3062089. (Accessed 1 March 2018.)

Thomas, Sarah. (2014). Celebrity in the 'Twitterverse': history, authenticity and the multiplicity of stardom. *Celebrity Studies* 5(3): 242–255.

Thompson, John B. (1995). *The Media and Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Time. (1974). The Press: *People*'s Premiere. *Time*, March 04, 1974. Available from http://www.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,944778,00.html. (Accessed 1 April 2013.)

Titlestad, Michael. (2005). Jazz discourse and black South African modernity, with special reference to "Matshikese". *American Ethnologist* 32(2): 210–221.

TMO Reporter. (2015). *heat* magazine to close. *The Media Online*, February 24, 2015. Available from https://themediaonline.co.za/2015/02/heat-magazine-to-close/. (Accessed 17 February 2017.)

Toll, Robert C. (1982). *The Entertainment Machine: American Show Business in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Tomaselli, Keyan. (1989). *The Cinema of Apartheid*. London, UK and New York, US: Routledge.

Tomaselli, Keyan (Ed.). (2006). *Encountering Modernity: 20th Century South African Cinemas.* Pretoria, SA: UNISA.

Trujillo, Nick and Vande Berg, Leah. (1994). From Wild Western Prodigy to Ageless Wonder: The Mediated Evolution of Nolan Ryan. In Susan J. Drucker & Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Turner, Graeme. (2004). *Understanding Celebrity.* London, UK: Sage.

Turner, Graeme. (2010). *Ordinary people and the media: The demotic turn*. London, UK: Sage.

Van der Westhuizen, J.G.L. (1973). ‘n Ondersoek na die moontlike verband tussen motiveringspatrone en aspekte van die sosiaal-ekonomiese ontwikkeling van die Afrikaner. (Doctoral thesis, University of Port Elizabeth, SA, 1973.)

Van Eeden, A. (1981). *Die Huisgenoot* as family magazine from 1916 to 1978. (Doctoral thesis, University of South Africa, 1981.)

Van Krieken, Robert. (2012). *Celebrity Society*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Van Nierop, Leon. (2016). *Daar doer in die fliek: ‘n Persoonlike blik op die geskiedenis van die Afrikaanse rolprent*. Pretoria, SA: Protea Books.

Van Zoonen, Liesbet and Harmer, Emily. (2011). The visual challenge of celebrity politics? Female politicians in *Grazia*. *Celebrity Studies* 2(1): 94–96.

Wallace, Carol Wilkie. (1994). Rhetorical Devices for Hero Making: Charles Lindbergh and John F. Kennedy. In Susan J. Drucker and Robert S. Cathcart (Eds.), *American Heroes in a Media Age*. New York, US: Hampton Press.

Wasserman, Herman. (2006). Tackles and sidesteps: normative maintenance and paradigm repair in mainstream reactions to tabloid journalism. *Communicare* 25(1): 59–80.

Weber, Maximillian. (1922). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Translated from German by A.R. Anderson and Talcott Parsons, 1947, New York, US: The Free Press.

Whannel, Gary. (2002). *Media Sport Stars: Masculinities and Moralities*. London, UK: Routledge.

Wheeler, Mark. (2013). *Celebrity Politics: Image and Identity in Contemporary Political Communications*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.