

**Sue Joseph**

## **What if Tom Wolfe was Australian?**

### Abstract:

Ever since Tom Wolfe wrote a thirteen page essay entitled *The Birth of the New Journalism*, eyewitness report by Tom Wolfe in the Seventies, debate has raged over what this New Journalism or literary journalism or creative non-fiction is. Yet geographically, the debate has been confined to the United States and the UK. Australia has remained notably silent on the issue.

This paper questions why the discourse seems to be anchored in the Northern Hemisphere. It further wonders whether, if Tom Wolfe had been born in Australia and published his essay in an Australian newspaper, would the signature diverse and ongoing discourse be Australian?

One thing would be certain, no matter where the debate was born – the nomenclature would not be definitive. There is no consensus among media theorists about an appropriate name. This paper investigates the history of the evolution of the genre pre and post Tom Wolfe, adding an Australian perspective to the discussion.

Creative non-fiction courses are in high demand within the Australian Academy. Coupled with the advent of instantaneous internet news, this paper suggests that perhaps Australian newspapers should recognise and then use this genre to reinvigorate its backgrounding news sections, investing journalists with more time and resources to write within the genre on running news stories of the day.

### Biographical Note:

Dr Sue Joseph has been a journalist for thirty years, working both in Australia and the UK. She began working as an academic, teaching print journalism at UTS in 1997. In that year, she published her first book of journalism, *She's My Wife; He's Just Sex*.

She has currently completed her second book manuscript *Speaking Secrets* as part of a non-traditional PhD project, focussing on literary journalism and ethics.

She teaches across both the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes at UTS, in the print journalism subjects. Her current research project is the development of a third book, this one on Australian creative non-fiction writers, and their processes.

### Key words:

New Journalism - creative non-fiction - literary journalism history – Australian discourse

*Literary journalists aim to go beyond journalism's facts but stop short of fiction's creations.*  
Thomas Connery<sup>1</sup>

What makes journalism 'literary'? What makes non-fiction 'creative'? Why is there a mountain of writing on this particular topic, the naming of a genre, in the North Americas but a dearth of the same debate in Australia? The lexicon swirls around the American genre like a vortex and never, ever settles but seemingly spits out even more suggestions.

One of the main reasons literary journalism or creative non-fiction stands out from daily journalism or feature writing, apart from length, is because of the greater degree of engagement with its subjects, purportedly lending a richer voice and greater reading experience. And because it engenders a more literary flavour, implementing literary techniques such as scene-setting and first person narrative, to name a few, found in fiction and drama writing.

Tom Wolfe's book entitled *The New Journalism* (1973), which flowed on from his 1972 essay, is an anthology of twenty-three pieces by some of the most prodigious American exponents of the genre at the time.<sup>2</sup>

What was so startling about Wolfe's stance at the time was his argument that fictional technique can be used to relay fact, and his declaration that this sort of writing would replace the novel as it was known. He wrote:

What interested me was not simply the discovery that it was possible to write accurate non-fiction with techniques usually associated with novels and short stories. It was that – plus. It was the discovery that it was possible in non-fiction, in journalism, to use any literary device, from the dialogisms of the essay to stream-of-consciousness, and to use many different kinds simultaneously, or within a relatively short space (Wolfe 1973: 5).

His epiphany offended as many as it inspired but his analysis was clear and his aim stated: '...to excite the reader both intellectually and emotionally' (Wolfe 1973: p.28). But Tom Wolfe never claimed that New Journalism was actually new. He certainly didn't name it that himself. What he referred to in the opening lines of his article was the beginning of 'the first new direction in American literature in half a century' (Wolfe 1973: 3). He called it a new notion – that it was possible for journalism to read like a novel.

American author and editor Seymour Krim first heard the name in 1965 when a request came through for an article called 'The New Journalism' – slated to be an article written about Jimmy Breslin and Gay Talese.<sup>3</sup> Wolfe claims it was in late 1966 that people started talking about New Journalism (Wolfe 1973: 23).

Wolfe defers to the problems of anything being called new, writing that to do so is 'just begging for trouble' (Wolfe 1973:3). It was more really a fresh attempt at a certain form of journalism which took on a life of its own in the 1960s and 1970s, more because of the controversy surrounding certain assumptions about its celebrity, and the celebrity of its proponents, than anything else.

The certainty is that it definitely was not ‘new’ although it shook up the industry and created vociferous discourse. Flowing on from that discourse has been invaluable debate and discussion which has inspired not just more aspirations to richer writing, but has informed critique and analysis of it. Effectively, the result has been a keen and more incisive regard of what literary journalists and creative non-fiction writers do, and how they do it, closely scrutinised, catalogued and archived by academics and practitioners themselves. But it has mostly all derived from the Northern Hemisphere. There is a part of me that wonders if Tom Wolfe had been born in Australia, would this nation lay claim to the mountain of discourse, and the Americas be shrugging their shoulders. There is no doubting that Australians love their non-fiction reading. For example, from 2002 to 2003, 24 million non-fiction books were sold in this country while only 10.6 million fiction books were sold – a difference of 13.4 million. One year on and the gap had increased to 19.2 million (Blair 2007: 29).

But in Australia, there is a dearth of research, debate, discussion and recorded history defining a recognisable literary group. Even a cursory literature review sheds light on the fact that as an analysed and archived genre, Australian creative non-fiction as such does not exist. There are no anthologies claiming the genre as a unit, significantly Australian, as exist in the USA and UK. Because apart from a handful of Australian journalists and academics, the discussion about what is literary journalism or creative non-fiction, does not get off the ground here, even though it is taught throughout the academy with a great demand from students.

And does it really matter? We are talking about a branding, and a branding that all the research in the past forty years cannot agree upon. That in itself is telling. Perhaps in Australia we have kept quiet, in the discursive sense, while struggling to simply produce it, scattered throughout the vast array of book publications and films and longer form narrative magazine and newsprint.

Australian journalist and academic Matthew Ricketson claims there is no satisfactory, authoritative definition for the form (Ricketson 1997: 82). Ricketson told *The Media Report*’s Jackie May:

In a way, it’s actually easier to recognise literary journalism than it is to define it... In my view and experience literary journalism explores the complexities of events, of issues, of people’s lives; literary journalism takes you to places and tells you stories that you probably haven’t even dreamed of. Literary journalism is better researched and better written than daily journalism; literary journalism plumbs emotional depths in ways that daily journalism studiously avoids, or clunks around. Literary journalism makes a deeper connection with its readers. A good piece of literary journalism stays with readers, like a good novel stays with a reader.<sup>4</sup>

He argues that the reason Australia has not been rich in this particular burgeoning genre is because of the enormity of the continent and the relatively small size of its population, unable to sustain a large and more diverse publication tradition. He believes Australian newspapers use narrative to flesh out news stories for their audiences rather than spending the time and money on allowing journalists to undertake pieces of literary journalism. Internationally, this practice is largely enabled by publications similar to the *New Yorker* and *Esquire* (US) and *Granta* (UK) (Ricketson 1997: 82). But just because regular magazine publications like the now defunct *Australian Society*, *The Independent Monthly*, *Nation Review* and *The National Times*, could not sustain the genre does not mean it is not still happening.

There are many fine examples of profile writing in *The Good Weekend* and *The Australian* weekly magazines, and *The Monthly* magazine produces many excellent examples of literary journalism in the form of the Essay. But rarely do Australian magazines produce the long form narrative type of creative non-fiction or literary journalism seen regularly in the States. Perhaps *The Australian's* Inside Story is the most consistent proponent of a form of regular literary journalism, dependent on the subject matter and author. But most of this type of creative non-fiction writing in Australia is now appearing in book form, later adapted to TV drama or film form. John Sylvester and Andrew Rule's *Underbelly* is an evocative example of the success and demand for this type of narrative. One of the real sticking points, though, as mentioned above, is the naming of this particular genre.

### **The Old New Journalism**

Perhaps here in Australia we are too tentative to enter the naming debate, so skirt around its edges. There is not an explicit culture or history of Australian creative non-fiction or literary journalism. It can be argued that Banjo Patterson and Henry Lawson were doing it in *The Bulletin* about the same time as this type of narrative writing began in the States and the UK. And journalist Mark Mordue points to Richard Neville and 'that kind of irreverent tone, that kind of larrikin voice in publications like 'Oz' from the '60s (in May, 2005) as an indicator of a kind of literary journalism culture. But he also believes it's a 'buried history'. He says: "It's forgotten, it's overlooked, it's piecemeal and it's invariably under-rated" (Mordue 2005). For example, I doubt that even one of the greatest Australian proponents of the genre Wilfred Burchett<sup>5</sup> is even known by young journalists, journalism or writing students, let alone studied, despite his legacy of rich and raw war correspondence and reports. It mainly just seems unrecorded and unrecognised as a whole, here in Australia. Mordue believes: '... the history has to be revealed, the room needs to be made for the next wave' (2005).

The identifiable history to date really belongs to the USA and the UK. Gloria Steinem suggests that indeed, the New Journalism of the 1960s and '70s is merely really old journalism, the sort of journalism that existed before the arrival of the telegraph machine when all news was written in some sort of literary form – essay or short story form (Weber 1974: 77).<sup>6</sup> And William L. Rivers<sup>7</sup> also believes there was not a lot new about this writing. He says: 'The new non-fiction is the only part of the New Journalism that actually *is* new. One can find all the other aspects here or there in practices that are centuries old' (Rivers in Weber 1974: 240).

In a way, the English satirists of the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries were early proponents of this type of impassioned journalism, and it was more to do with a formula to attack the establishment and spark questioning debate without being jailed or executed, than anything else. Jonathan Swift wrote a series of essays condemning British foreign policy.<sup>8</sup> One, *A Modest Proposal*, advocated dealing with Irish poverty by eating Irish children.<sup>9</sup> Charles Dickens assumed the pseudonym Boz to produce the original five essays he entitled *Street Sketches*.<sup>10</sup> They depicted life on the streets of London, with all its misery and poverty and colour, and were so popular that he went on to write forty-eight more (Weingarten 2006: 11).

Charles Dana's *New York Sun* throughout the 1880s lent itself to well-crafted and colourful news stories, focussing on everyday lives. And when Joseph Pulitzer bought the *New York World* in 1883, he attempted to poach some of Dana's staff, precisely because of the style of writing they were producing (Boynton 2005: xxiv).

Three of the leading American proponents of this form of writing at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were: Stephen Crane in his *New York Sketches*;<sup>11</sup> Lincoln Steffens and his work as editor on the *New York Commercial Advertiser*;<sup>12</sup> and Hutchins Hapgood in his accounts of immigrant life *The Spirit of the Ghetto* published in the *Commercial Advertiser*.<sup>13</sup>

Stephen Crane painted true-life pictures of New York City in his series called *The New York City Sketches*, published mostly throughout 1894. He took everyday happenings on the street, and used specific literary techniques to bring them to life in the paper such as dialogue, contrast, description, scene setting, clear imagery and irony. His view of what he was writing was totally subjective – he himself said that he wrote in order 'to give readers a slice out of life' with no other purpose 'than to show people as they seem to me' (Connery in Sims 1990: 8).

Lincoln Steffens, largely known as one of the greatest proponents of American muckraking at the time, wrote about what he was attempting at the *Advertiser*: '...to make a new kind of daily journalism, personal, literary and immediate'.<sup>14</sup> He wanted people to: '...see, not merely read of it, as it was: rich and poor, wicked and good, ugly and beautiful, growing, great'. He claimed to hire men and women 'picked for their unusual literary prose' and let it be known to the universities of Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Columbia that his paper wanted 'not newspaper men, but writers' (Connery in Sims 1990: 10).

Steffens said: 'It is scientifically and artistically the true ideal for an artist and for a newspaper – to get the news so completely and to report it so humanely that the reader will see himself in the other fellow's place' (Boynton 2005: xxiv).

Accordingly, when Hutchins Hapgood was looking for work, he chose the *Advertiser* because he believed he would fit in well with other staff Steffens had employed who believed in 'Steffens's idea of literary journalism' (Connery in Sims 1990: 11). Hutchins Hapgood described his own contributions to the *Advertiser* not as story-telling but as '...a short article which is a mixture of news and personal reaction put together in a loose literary form'. Later, again possibly as a part of the burgeoning debate, Hapgood actually called for a style of writing combining journalism and literature in a 1905 *Bookman* article (Connery in Sims 1990: 15).<sup>15</sup>

Around this time, Hapgood's call for a more literary form of journalism went virtually unheard, as the 'highly fashionable muckrakers' were attracting most of the attention (Connery in Sims 1990: 17). And because of this, the two prose forms – that of fiction and journalism – continued as two separate styles. But the essence of the amalgam style by the likes of Crane, Steffens and Hapgood did evolve slowly, just not as mainstream writing. Thomas B. Connery argues this slowly-evolving amalgam style actually became a third prose form: 'Such writing attempted to go beyond journalism's facts but stopped short of fiction's creations and sought a fusion of the

role of observer and maker into a literary journalism that presented a third way to depict reality' (Connery in Sims 1990: 18).

It is clear that the New Journalism of the 1960s onwards was not 'new'. Connery identified a form of writing which was a distinct forerunner of the genre at the turn of the last century although he concedes this form was not highly influential on the 1960s' New Journalism movement, simply 'precursors' to it (Connery in Sims 1990: 18).

Jack London sought deep and personal perspective when he wrote *The People of the Abyss*.<sup>16</sup> Inspired by the writings of Dickens in his *Street Sketches*, sixty-six years later the American journalist set out to see and feel what Dickens had seen and felt. In 1903, he wrote in the preface of his book: 'I went down into the underworld of London to see with an attitude of mind which I may best liken to that of an explorer' (London 1903).

As London was inspired by Dickens, so Eric Blair, later to call himself George Orwell, was inspired by Jack London's *The People of the Abyss*. Orwell spent three years immersing himself with the poor and impoverished of London and Paris, compared to Jack London's twelve months. His musings came together in his book *Down and Out in London and Paris*.<sup>17</sup>

John Hersey launched his career travelling through Europe, China and Japan during World War II, writing for *Time*, *Life* and *The New Yorker*. Interviewed for *The Paris Review* in 1986, Hersey said of the time:

I guess I'd been thinking from the beginning, and had been experimenting a little bit with pieces I did for *Life*, the notion that journalism could be enlivened by using devices of fiction. My principal reading all along had been fiction, even though I was working for *Time* on fact pieces (Weingarten 2006, p.19).

But it is his post-war piece *Hiroshima*, in *The New Yorker*, which clearly places him as masterful literary journalist, and mainly through the technique of relaying what his subjects were thinking, when the atomic bomb exploded over their city on August 6, 1945. Humanising the 'enemy' as his six Japanese subjects described the moment the bomb was dropped – published in 1946, a year since the end of the war – was brave. And in 1999, Hersey's *Hiroshima* was voted by the New York University's journalism department as the most important news story of the twentieth century (Weingarten 2006: 24).

## The Criticism

Tom Wolfe pays tribute to the people who were 'doing' the New Journalism all around him in the mid-1960s. He names feature writers Thomas B. Morgan, Brock Brower, Terry Southern and Gay Talese at *Esquire*. Also novelists Norman Mailer and James Baldwin who were also writing for *Esquire*. He writes of his colleagues at the Sunday supplement of *New York* – Jimmy Breslin, Gail Sheehy and Tom Gallagher. He claims they were all just writing; that there was an 'air of excitement' all around about what they were writing but that at the time, he never 'had the

slightest idea that any of it might have an impact on the literary world or...any sphere outside the small world of feature journalism' (Wolfe 1973: 23).

When the criticism started flowing, Wolfe saw it as 'bitterness, envy and resentment' (Wolfe 1973: 24) from both sides of the fence: the literati, and those who believed in a purer form of reportage journalism. Ronald Weber writes: 'To the degree that journalism pushes toward literature it opens itself to attack both as second-rate literature and second-rate journalism' (Weber 1974: 23). This seems to be what occurred.

Weber's argument is that New Journalism was neither exactly literature nor exactly journalism but a blending of the both, making itself vulnerable on both sides. This is what he sees as the heart of the harsh criticism of the genre at the time (Weber 1974: 23). Wolfe himself found no mystery in why journalists criticised the sudden explosion of a seemingly new genre, with a journalism tag. He writes that newspaper people: '...were better than railroad men at resisting anything labelled new'. He assumes a universal knowledge that railway men are intransigent, and journalists just the same – they resist change. But he harks back to an Eighteenth Century class model to explain the literati disquiet – he claims novelists, and the occasional playwright or poet, were the upper class; the middle class were the men of letters or essayists; and the lower classes were the journalists. He writes: '...the sudden arrival of this new style of journalism, from out of nowhere, had caused a status panic in the literary community'. The upper class: 'were regarded as the only creative writers, the only literary artists. They had exclusive entry to the soul of man, the profound emotions, the eternal mysteries'. What journalists were doing taking these skills and weaving them throughout their reportage was seen as a challenge to this elitist status quo (Wolfe 1973: 25).

Dan Wakefield simplified the matter.<sup>18</sup> He claimed that the criticism was derivative of an old prejudice that good writing solely by definition must be fictional. He lays the art component of this type of reporting down to simple technique. He claims the author does not distort the facts, neither are they made up. He has:

...presented them in a full instead of naked manner, brought out the sights, sounds and feel surrounding those facts, and connected them by comparison with other facts of history, society, and literature in an artistic manner that does not diminish but gives greater depth and dimension to the facts (Wakefield in Weber 1974: 41).

Wakefield specifically cites Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*, querying its journalistic merit. He believes Capote 'did as honest and skilful a job as possible in his recreation' (Wakefield in Weber 1974: 47) of the 1959 murder of the Clutter family in Holcomb, Kansas, but is sceptical to say the least about the recall of the many dozens of people Capote quoted (Wakefield in Weber 1974: 47). But Capote himself never called his book journalism – on the contrary, he claimed it as the new art form of the 'non-fiction novel'.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, he still claimed it as a non-fiction (Plimpton in Weber 1974: 190).

Wakefield also queries that Capote was the 'Columbus of the non-fiction novel', not because it had not been thought of before but because those who did think of it rejected it, firstly as journalism, and secondly, as an art form (Wakefield in Weber

1974: 46). Basically, how could a novel be non-fiction and how could non-fiction, by definition, be deemed a novel.

One of the most respected American creative non-fiction writers, Gay Talese, was actually credited with ‘starting’ the New Journalism movement by Tom Wolfe in his book the *New Journalism*, a nomenclature he has never wanted and does not accept. He writes:

I’m often given credit for ‘starting’ the New Journalism...while I was kind of flattered that people were, for the first time, starting to take notice of what I was doing, I have always kind of thought of myself as rather traditional in my approach and not so ‘new’. I never wanted to do something ‘new’; I wanted to do something that would hold up over time, something that could get old and still have the same resonance (Hirschman 2004).

### A Terrible Name

Matthew Ricketson is in good company searching for a suitable title for the literary journalism genre – American academic Barbara Lounsberry dedicates pages in an introduction she wrote on non-fiction analysis to just that. She compares the floundering to find a name for this form of writing in the past forty years to Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson and Henry Fielding trying to entitle their own literary contributions. She writes:

In the first half of the eighteenth century, they were struggling to name their own new narrative prose form – a form we have no difficulty today calling the novel.

In desperation Fielding finally called *Tom Jones* a ‘comic epic-poem in prose’!

Historical perspective in fact is what has been missing in many of the ‘new journalism’, fact/fiction debates of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. In some respects we are seeing the turn of the wheel back to the time, only 200 years ago, when serious writers chose non-fiction over fiction for expressing their views and crafting their art (Lounsberry 1990: xiii).

She is thinking of the likes of essayists Joseph Addison, Sir Richard Steele, William Hazlitt, and James Boswell. Authors like Robert Louis Stevenson. Journalists and writers like John Hersey, Truman Capote, Norman Mailer, Ernest Hemingway.

She also decides that there is no correct ‘term for this discourse’ but that should not preclude studying and critiquing it. She leans towards the terms literary or artistic nonfiction, positing it as an identifiable discourse ‘recognisable in its solid central particulars, though blurring (as all genres do) at the edges’ (Lounsberry 1990: xiii).

Barbara Lounsberry sums it up:

We come down finally to the odd declaration that in our time literary non-fiction is a form of writing with a distinguished history, untold possibilities, and a terrible name. Literary non-fiction is certainly *not fiction* – although some works read like novels. Artful non-fiction is more than fiction, offering the satisfying truths of fact and the ‘universal truths’ of art (Lounsberry, Talese 1996: 30).

Ronald Weber also claims there is no dispute – indeed he claims it is the only thing beyond dispute – that the New Journalism is ‘badly named’ (Weber 1974: 13).

There is no doubt this type of writing is an emerging, controversial and ever-developing field. Looking back over the American and British history, it is clear its emergence has been in waves but it has always been there, in some form or other. Perhaps the 1960s onslaught was in response to the times – rock and roll, the Vietnam



War, the peace movement, the Women's Movement, sexual liberation, drug use. Regular he said/she said type of reporting just did not seem to be able to do this culturally explosive time any type of justice. Some thirty years later, American literary journalist Norman Sims writes of its further development 'to include immersion reporting, accuracy, voice, structure, responsibility, and symbolic representation (Sims 1995: 9). And since then, he claims: '...writers have wanted to add to the list a personal involvement with their materials, and an artistic creativity not often associated with non fiction. An innovative genre that is still developing, literary journalism resists narrow definitions' (Sims 1995: 9).

Robert Boynton has identified this other group of writers, the successors of the New Journalism of the 1960s onwards, calling them the New New Journalists. He lists them as: Adrian Nicole LeBlanc, Michael Lewis, Lawrence Weschler, Eric Schlosser, Richard Preston, Alex Kotlowitz, Jon Krakauer, William Langewiesche, Lawrence Wright, William Finnegan, Ted Conover, Jonathan Harr and Susan Orlean, to name a few. He argues these writers in particular have positioned themselves 'at the very centre of contemporary American literature... and bring a distinct set of cultural and social concerns to their work. Neither frustrated novelists nor wayward newspaper reporters, they tend to be magazine and books writers who have benefited enormously from the legitimacy Wolfe's legacy has brought to literary non-fiction' (Boynton 2005: xi). Boynton goes on to claim that the new generation of writers experiments more with the way they get the story, than the language used or how a story is written.

Regardless of the emerging field, thirty five years later, Tom Wolfe's prediction has not been realised – the novel is still well and truly not replaced – but literary journalism and creative non-fiction has grown into a broadly, if badly-defined and well debated, genre of its own, embedded within the professional practice of journalism. Although interestingly, it is taught more in creative writing courses than journalism courses throughout the academy, despite its hybrid make up.

There is no denying that some of the most successful pieces of writing toward the end of the twentieth century were exactly what Wolfe did predict: true life informed by fictional technique. These are the stories Hollywood then picks up and catapults even further into people's lives – the stories of ordinary people, made extraordinary by what happens to them or how they conduct themselves or what they discover or where they are, at a particular point in time. This is what engages readers.

But the potential for solid, innovative literary journalism or creative non-fiction to address the miracle of instantaneous internet information, at the press of a button, and reinvigorate the newspaper and magazine industries in this country, is gaining momentum amongst Australian journalism academics and students, as it has already been recognised in the States. For example, the *New Yorker* has the highest re-subscription rate in the world, at 85 per cent and its circulation has gone up by 32 percent to more than 1 million copies a week. Interestingly, the magazine's 18-24 readership has grown by 24 percent, and its 25-34 readership has grown a staggering 52 percent in the past decade (Butterworth 2008).

With the ascendance of the internet, with instantaneous coverage of news and occurrences not just locally, and nationally, but internationally, there is an argument for propelling this form of journalism from Australian writing and journalism schools

into Australian newsrooms. The Director of the Nieman Program on Narrative Journalism Lisa Birks<sup>20</sup> posed the question at the 2001 Nieman Journalism Conference:

What are newspapers going to do to get their readers back? ... Everybody loves a story. Newspapers are the ones to revive narrative and draw people with it...Anecdotally, we're finding that excellence in narrative not only brings people back to newspapers, but makes them loyal readers and encourages them to trust the writer (in Johnston, 2007: 3).

And Griffith University's Jane Johnston goes on to claim:

The inverted pyramid, once the mainstay of the news section of newspapers and news writing courses, is now considered only one choice, alongside more creative, less structured narrative styles, informed by elements of fiction writing and more consistent with feature style. What might be identified as an increased readability of stories and engagement with the reader could well be a response to declining newspaper readerships which are demanding more entertainment and less straight information in their news diets, especially in the competitive and expanding media environment (2007: 14).

If she is correct, the stage may be set for a resurgence of the quality writing from the '70s' *National Times* and *Nation Review*. And if this is so, journalism and writing schools, in holding onto the tenets of insisting on quality writing, should invest in its future by yes, embracing new technologies as they unfold around us, but not to ever forget the tools of the trade – excellence and depth in writing incorporating fictional technique and skill, resourced research and backgrounding, and time, combined with a rigorous upholding of ethics and honesty. Literary journalism or creative non-fiction at its best.

## List of works cited

- Boynton, R. 2005, *The New New Journalism*, Vintage Books, USA
- Connery, T. 1990, ed. Norman Sims, *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford University Press
- Lounsberry, B. 1990, *The Art of Fact, Contemporary Artists of Nonfiction*, Greenwood Press, Connecticut, USA
- Lounsberry, B. & Talese, G. (eds.) 1996, *Writing Creative Non-Fiction: Literature of Reality*, Harper Collins, USA
- Ricketson, M. 1997, *Helen Garner's The First Stone: Hitchhiking on the Credibility of Other Writers*, in Jenna Mead (ed.), *bodyjamming*, Random House, Australia, p.79-100
- 2004, *Writing Feature Stories: how to research and write newspaper and magazine articles*, Allen and Unwin, Australia
- Sims, N. & Kramer, M. (eds.) 1995, *Literary Journalism*, Ballantine Books, New York
- Weber, R. (ed.) 1974, *The Reporter As Artist, A Look at the New Journalism Controversy*, Communication Arts Books, New York
- Weingarten, M. 2006, *The Gang that Wouldn't Write Straight*, Crown Publishers, New York
- Wolfe, T. 1973, *The New Journalism*, Harper and Row, Publishers

## Internet

- Butterworth, T. 2008, *Lunch with the FT: David Remnick*, The Financial Time Limited, July 12, viewed October 14, 2008  
<http://www.ft.com/comment/columnists/lunchwiththef>
- London, J. 1903, *The People of the Abyss*, Macmillan, viewed June 7, 2007  
<http://www.jacklondon.net/writings/PeopleOfTheAbyss/preface.html>
- Hirschman, D. 2004, *So What Do You Do, Gay Talese?* April 27, viewed May 6, 2006  
<http://www.mediabistro.com/articles/cache/a1498.asp>

## Periodicals

- Blair, M. 2007, *Uncovering the place of Australian creative non-fiction in Australian journalism departments*, APME Issue No.18, Dec. p. 17-30
- Johnston, J. 2007, *Turning the inverted pyramid upside down*, APME Issue No.18, Dec. p. 1-16

## Radio

- The Media Report, 2005, ABC, *Literary Journalism*, interview by Julia May, June 23

<sup>1</sup> *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*, 1990, p.18

<sup>2</sup> Capote's *In Cold Blood*; Mailer's *The Armies of the Night*; Plimpton's *Paper Lion*; Thompson's *The Hell's Angels, A Strange and Terrible Saga*; McGinniss's *The Selling of the President*; Rex Reed's *Do you Sleep in the Nude?*; Michael Herr's *Khe Sanh*; Joan Didion *Slouching Towards Bethlehem*; Joe Eszterhas' *Charlie Simpson's Apocalypse*; and Terry Southern's *Red Dirt Marijuana and Other Tastes*, to name a few.

---

<sup>3</sup> while Krim was editor of *Nugget*, 1961-5

<sup>4</sup> The Media Report, ABC, *Literary Journalism*, June 23, 2005

<sup>5</sup> 1911-1983

<sup>6</sup> *Gloria Steinem: An Interview*, appeared in *The Bulletin* of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, February 1971, later reproduced in *The Reporter as Artist*, edited by Ronald Weber

<sup>7</sup> *The New Confusion* by William L. Rivers, first published in *The Progressive*, December 1971

<sup>8</sup> in 1710, became editor of the *Examiner*

<sup>9</sup> 1729 essay, written and published by Swift

<sup>10</sup> 1836, for the *Morning Chronicle*

<sup>11</sup> most were published in the *New York Press*, 1894

<sup>12</sup> from 1897

<sup>13</sup> published in 1902; reprinted in 1967

<sup>14</sup> best known for his muckraking work at *McClure's* magazine at the beginning of the Twentieth Century

<sup>15</sup> *A New Form of Literature*, *Bookman*, 21:424, 1905

<sup>16</sup> first published by MacMillan in 1903

<sup>17</sup> published in England in 1931; French edition in 1935

<sup>18</sup> *The Personal Voice and the Impersonal Eye* by Dan Wakefield, first published in *Atlantic*, June 1966

<sup>19</sup> *Truman Capote: An Interview* by George Plimpton, first published in the *New York Times Book Review*, January 16, 1966

<sup>20</sup> reported by Liza Weisstuch (Nov 2001) Talking stories, Nieman hosts 'narrative journalism' luminaries at conference, *Harvard University Gazette*.