

ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE PRACTICE OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM

Matthew David Ricketson

Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Monash University, 1980

Master of Arts (Communication Studies) RMIT, 2000

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

September 2009

School of English, Communications and Performance Studies

Faculty of Arts

Monash University

Copyright Notices

Notice 1

Under the Copyright Act 1968, this thesis must be used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing. In particular no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

Notice 2

I certify that I have made all reasonable efforts to secure copyright permissions for third-party content included in this thesis and have not knowingly added copyright content to my work without the owner's permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION: RE-FRAMING THE CRITICAL DEBATE.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE NATURE AND RANGE OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM	31
CHAPTER THREE: AUSTRALIAN PRACTITIONERS’ EXPERIENCE OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM.....	64
CHAPTER FOUR: ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING IN RESEARCHING BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM.....	99
CHAPTER FIVE: ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING IN REPRESENTING PEOPLE, EVENTS AND ISSUES IN BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM.....	141
CHAPTER SIX: ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING IN PRACTITIONERS’ RELATIONSHIP WITH READERS OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM.	187
LIST OF WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED	236
PRIMARY SOURCES	236
A. Practitioners’ papers:.....	236
B. Interviews:.....	236
C. Book-length journalism:.....	236
SECONDARY SOURCES	243
APPENDICES	265
APPENDIX A – Book-length journalism on the <i>Publishers Weekly</i> annual top ten non-fiction bestseller list 1960 to 2008	265
APPENDIX B – Questionnaire for Australian practitioners of book-length journalism.....	269
A. Overview of the interviewee’s career as a journalist and as a novelist:	269
B. The research phase of a work of book-length journalism:.....	269
C. The writing phase of a work of book-length journalism:	270
D. The reception of a work of book-length journalism:	270
APPENDIX C – Book-length journalism included in the lists of the best American and the best Australian journalism of the twentieth century	272
APPENDIX D – Book-length journalism that has won the Pulitzer prize for general non-fiction between 1962 and 2008.....	275
APPENDIX E – Australian book-length journalism on the Nielsen BookScan annual list of top fifty non-fiction bestsellers between 2002 and 2008	277
APPENDIX F – Book-length journalism that has won the Queensland Premier’s Literary award for advancing public debate between 1999 and 2008	279
APPENDIX G – Notable works of Australian book-length journalism	280

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to examine a part of journalism practice that has received less scholarly attention as journalism practice and more as an area of writing that is or aspires to have literary or artistic merit. It is called book-length journalism and is defined as the practice of using journalistic methods to research and write independently about contemporary actual people, events, and issues at book-length in a timely manner for a broad audience. This thesis examines the most pressing ethical issues arising in what I argue is a vibrant, growing and significant area of practice. The examination shows how some leading practitioners have engaged with these issues and resolved them while others have ignored or struggled to come to grips with them. The practice of book-length journalism may be vibrant but the term itself is not widely known or used, partly because the practice sits not in but alongside other print journalism and is subsumed into the broad publishing category of non-fiction, and partly because of scholarly emphasis on literariness and art. The effect is to occlude three important points: first, the extent to which journalism is practiced at book-length, second the particular ethical issues arising in this area and third the conflating of a narrative approach with notions of literary merit.

Ethical issues arise for practitioners throughout the process. Some are similar to those encountered by practitioners working in newspapers and magazines while others take on a different form or are felt more urgently. I examine these issues by interviewing and studying the work of leading Australian practitioners and then by developing a tripartite framework that follows the practitioner from the research phase to the representation phase to their relationship with readers. Close readings of two landmark works – Truman Capote’s *In Cold Blood* and Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein’s *The Final Days* – as well as other American practitioners’ work reveals that the practice of journalism at book-length brings together an interlocking concentration of ethical issues; first, practitioners need to negotiate and manage close relationships with their principal sources while maintaining a sense of editorial independence. Second, when writing in a narrative mode they need to balance the demands of veracity inherent in a form making truth-telling claims with the desirability of creating a narrative that engages readers emotionally and intellectually. I argue that it is the taking of a narrative

approach to representing people and events that triggers certain ethical issues, not whether the practitioner is an artist. Capote is widely regarded as a far more accomplished prose stylist than Woodward but they face the same ethical issues in the writing phase and both struggle to resolve them. Third, practitioners present their work in books, a form which many readers associate with fiction, especially when presented with a book that reads like a work of fiction and offers little guidance that it is not fiction but journalism. For this reason, I argue practitioners have an ethical obligation to make clear what they are offering readers.

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, Matthew David Ricketson, declare that the thesis submitted contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution.

I affirm that the thesis consists only of my original work, and that where other material has been used due acknowledgement has been made in the text and in the bibliography.

Matthew David Ricketson.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The declaration on the previous page solemnly states this is all my original work except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text and the bibliography, which is certainly true as far as it goes but it says nothing about the people who have supported, guided and inspired me in this project. They include former colleagues from RMIT's Journalism program, Sybil Nolan, Nick Richardson and especially Muriel Porter, who read a draft of the thesis, as well as cinema studies colleagues Adrian Danks and Peter Kemp who shared their knowledge and passion for documentary with me. They also include former students at RMIT, particularly Kimina Lyall and Sophie Vorrath. Thanks to Mitchell Stephens for advice when I decided to transplant his Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century project to Australia, and for continuing collegiality. Thanks to Bruce Shapiro who I met through the Dart Center for Journalism and Trauma; he has shown keen interest in this project and offered valuable advice. In my last stint in the news media industry, at *The Age*, which finished earlier this year, I was fortunate to work alongside many fine journalists who between deadlines shared their thoughts with that blend of incisiveness, street-savvy and unexpected wells of knowledge that seems unique to newsrooms. They include: Paul Austin, Garry Barker, Shaun Carney, Kate Cole-Adams, Gordon Farrer, Daniel Flitton, Peter Hanlon, Ian McIlwraith, Mal Maiden, Katharine Murphy, Jim Schembri, Michael Short, Kirsty Simpson, Ruth Williams and Leonie Wood. They also include John Langdon, Frank Prain and Michelle Stillman in the newspaper's editorial library.

I would like to acknowledge support from the School of Applied Communication at RMIT, which provided a period of study leave early in my candidature, and *The Age*, especially Paul Ramadge, who approved a leave of absence from the newsroom so I could write a full draft. I would also like to thank my current employer, the University of Canberra, for providing me with a period of time to complete the thesis. I would probably never have begun this project if not for the urging of Jenna Mead who I first met when she asked me to contribute an essay to a book she was editing about *The First Stone* controversy. Her encouragement alternated between warm praise and back-of-the-axe bluntness; whichever, it got me going, and I am grateful to her. I would especially like to thank my supervisors, Dr Chris Worth and Dr Nina Philadelphoff-Puren. As

second supervisor Nina made careful and thoughtful comments on drafts; thank you. Chris has been a wonderful supervisor, unfailingly available and encouraging but continually prodding me to extend my thinking. I very much appreciate all his efforts.

Thanks to Win Callister for help with proof-reading. Finally, to my wife, Gill, and our three (all grewed up!) children, Gemma, Hayley and Josh, thank you, thank you, for your love and forbearance. Gill especially, as the lead supporter and emotional anchor for two PhDs – first her mother’s, then her husband’s – deserves her own kind of honorary doctorate from the university. Thank you once again darling.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION: RE-FRAMING THE CRITICAL DEBATE

A few years ago, I was introduced on radio in terms I still recall vividly. ‘Gideon Haigh,’ said the interviewer, ‘formerly a journalist, now a writer.’ Afterwards I chided my interlocutor. ‘What’s this about my being a writer? Check the bio: “Gideon Haigh is a Melbourne journalist.”’ He responded stubbornly: ‘But you write books. Journalists don’t write books.’

Gideon Haigh, creator of six works of book-length journalism (“Australian Book-length Journalism.” 2004).

Is New Journalism still alive? If so, is it any better than in the pioneering ‘60s, or has it just become old journalism? Thabo Jijana, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Tom Wolfe: (laughs). Well, the problem is, when you call any kind of movement new, you’ve already doomed it to an early death. There is some of it now, and it usually comes out in books. Mark Bowden’s *Black Hawk Down* is an example of it and a very good one. I don’t see it that much in magazines.

(“Ten Questions.” *Time*. 8 September 2008: 4).

This thesis is about what happens when journalism is practiced at book-length, which, at first blush, may seem a contradiction in terms. The roots of the word journalism suggest it is diurnal, of the day, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, while books take far longer than a day to produce. Newspapers are fresh daily, even hourly if you include their online editions, but that does not mean every article is written inside a day. Many are, but journalists working on feature articles or

investigations can spend days, weeks or, occasionally, months on their articles. Some newspapers are published weekly, as are some magazines and magazines are also published monthly; they all contain journalism as it is commonly understood. The practice of journalism can be extended further, to book length projects. That is, where practitioners use journalistic methods to research and write independently about contemporary actual people, events, and issues at book-length in a timely manner for a broad audience they are engaged in book-length journalism. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the thorniest ethical issues arising in what I will argue is a vibrant, growing and significant area of journalism practice and to make suggestions both within the academy and among practitioners for how it can be further improved.

The term book-length journalism may well be unfamiliar to scholars of journalism. Instead this area of practice is usually incorporated in other terms, such as: the New Journalism, a term coined in 1965 by journalist Pete Hamill and popularized by one of its best-known exponents and advocates, Tom Wolfe (Murphy *The New Journalism* 4-5); the “Nonfiction Novel,” which Truman Capote used on the dust-jacket of *In Cold Blood* in 1966; literary non-fiction, which is what Ronald Weber, an American studies scholar, calls it in his 1980 study *The Literature of Fact* and which has become the preferred term among literary studies scholars; literary journalism, which Norman Sims, a journalism scholar, redirected from its common usage denoting a journalist who writes about literature, in an anthology he edited in 1984, *The Literary Journalists*; creative non-fiction, which is championed by Lee Gutkind, founding editor in 1993 of an eponymous journal and author of a textbook *The Art of Creative Nonfiction*; narrative journalism, which has become popular since the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University devoted an issue of its quarterly Nieman Reports to it in 2000 (“Narrative Journalism” 4-44); and, finally, reportage, which was in use in the 1930s (Hartsock *A History of American Literary Journalism* 169) but gained fresh traction after 1987 through an anthology *The Faber Book of Reportage* edited and eloquently introduced by John Carey, a Professor of English at Oxford University.

This profusion of terms has several implications. The first, obvious one is that none of them has won even wide acceptance among either scholars or practitioners, despite considerable debate within journalism studies and literary studies. The

reasons for this include: the prickliness of journalists toward notions of literariness, the historic hostility of literary critics towards journalism, a frequent conflating of narrative with literary merit, resistance to defining a field in the negative (non-fiction) and vigorously contested philosophical debates about the nature of truth that bear directly on a field in which practices to verify facts and a narrative approach are central (Boynton *The New New Journalism* xi-xxxii; Hartsock *A History of American Literary Journalism* 1-20; Lehman *Matters of Fact* 1-39; Ricketson “True Stories” 150). In the first full-length history of this area of writing in the United States, John Hartsock found the antecedents of what he termed narrative literary journalism in the Roman *acta*, or gazettes (83-94). In the nineteenth century, however, journalism practice split into two streams; the first he calls discursive, the second narrative. These terms echo what Michael Schudson, in his pioneering study published in 1978, *Discovering the News*, offers as models of two ideal approaches to journalism, one founded in “information,” the other in “story” (89). The former model finds expression in what is known in the news media industry as the hard news report. It has been the form most closely associated with journalism since near the end of the nineteenth century (Mindich *Just the Facts* 64-94; Schudson, *The Power of News* 59-60). The story model has an even longer history, as Hartsock argues, and even today in newsrooms journalists routinely refer to what they are writing as a “story” or in Australia a “yarn” regardless of whether they are writing a hard news report or a feature article (Nell *Lost in a Book* 51). Newsroom vernacular does signal journalists’ implicit understanding of their role as storytellers rather than simple conduits for dispassionately gathered facts, as I have argued elsewhere (*Writing Feature Stories* xi-xii).

Terms like literary journalism, narrative journalism and creative non-fiction all seek to describe an area of writing where practitioners take a narrative approach to presenting their accounts of people, events and issues. Use of the word narrative in this way is well understood in newsrooms but within narrative studies the word carries multiple carefully delineated meanings (Abbott *Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* 13-27, 237-38; Herman *Cambridge Companion to Narrative* 22-35, 279-80). Similarly, Hartsock’s word for hard news, “discursive,” has become tied to the concept of discourse in modern cultural theory (Baldick *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 59). In this thesis, then, the term expository will be

used to refer to the hard news reporting style and the phrase writing in a narrative mode will be preferred to narrative, though such a phrase would probably attract the red pen of any self-respecting newspaper sub-editor. The effect of the cleaving of journalism into two primary forms, Hartsock argues, has been that what he calls narrative literary journalism has no natural home or champion within the academy. There have been signs of change in the past two decades, if not in the breaking down of the Balkan walls of academic disciplines, then in the steadily growing academic and professional literature (10-11), to which his study adds and testifies. Potential primary source material for this thesis in the form of new works of book-length journalism is published almost weekly; *Columbine*, Dave Cullen's painstaking reconstruction of the murder of high school students by classmates Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, was published just as the thesis was being completed, for instance. I have drawn a cut-off point in my surveying of the literature, both primary and secondary, at early 2009.

The second implication of the profusion of terms is that all are groping toward naming a writing practice that is not only about actual people, events and issues but is literary or artistic. The criteria scholars choose for defining a field have ramifications for what is included and what is excluded. Raymond Williams has shown how since the mid-eighteenth century the term "literature" has come to mean "well written" books that are "creative" or "imaginative" writing (*Keywords* 152). But as Andrew Milner asks, who defines what is well written, and why is creative or imaginative literature regarded as superior to other forms of writing? "The implicit premise that philosophy, science and history are somehow neither imaginative nor creative is very obviously indefensible" (*Literature, Culture and Society* 2). The notion that literature is inherently fictive is also questionable because there may be factual material in imaginative literature, argues Milner, citing John Milton's sonnet on his blindness that, according to the available biographical information, contains accurate information about the poet's condition and his response to it (2-3). From late in the nineteenth century, however, influential literary figures began exulting "imaginative literature" in prose – by which was meant fiction – as the most important form of writing and ignored or devalued other forms of prose, according to Hartsock (*A History of American Literary Journalism* 204-245). These were lumped together under a term that defined them in the negative: non-fiction (12). Following

Hartsock, and preferring to say what something is rather than what it is not, I use the term book-length journalism in this thesis rather than any term that includes the word non-fiction. The term book-length journalism may be inelegant, but it has the virtue of describing the medium and the scope of the activity. Saying what this area of writing practice is rather than what it is not provides a foundation for re-orienting the critical debate. It is not my purpose to argue for the setting up of a new genre called book-length journalism. In this field, the practitioner may be a newspaper or magazine journalist working at book-length or they may come to it from another background, such as novel-writing. What the practitioner does rather than their background is the key determinant; for that reason, the terms practitioner and journalist are used interchangeably in this thesis even when those discussed are better known as novelists. The word non-fiction is spelt with the hyphen in this thesis because that is the Oxford English Dictionary spelling and also because it makes explicit the separation from the word fiction. Exceptions will be made for titles and quotations from sources, usually American, that exclude the hyphen.

Whether this area of writing practice is or can be art or literature, however that may be defined, is an important question but not one that is central to this thesis. When literary or artistic criteria are used to define an area of writing practice, however, scholars are pushed into certain choices about what to study. I resist such a push, and not simply because I might want to argue with various critics' assessment of the literary or artistic qualities of various pieces of journalistic writing, but more importantly because such arguments have the effect of occluding three key issues: first, the extent to which it is practiced at book-length today, second the ethical issues that arise in this area of practice, and third the conflating of a narrative approach with notions of literary merit. Taking these issues one by one, scholars have understated the extent to which such journalism is practiced at book-length. Journalism written in a narrative mode can certainly be found in newspapers, in the United States and Australia, but it is more likely to be found in magazines, and, it appears, most likely to be found in books. I say appears because without universal agreement as to what constitutes this field, and because what I am calling book-length journalism is subsumed into the broad publishing category of non-fiction, it cannot be enumerated exactly. An early academic study of the New Journalism noted that much of it was published in book form (Murphy *The New Journalism* 17, 26). Edd Applegate drew

on seventeen anthologies and scholarly works to compile in 1996 *Literary Journalism: A Biographical Dictionary of Writers and Editors*, which included journalists and editors working in newspapers, magazines and in books. Even so, of the 172 people listed, 112, or about two-thirds, had written at least one work of book-length journalism, as it is defined in this thesis. In 2007, the Nieman Foundation collated contributions from journalists and editors reflecting on their practice at its annual Narrative Journalism conferences. Of the 53 contributors, 36 had written at least one work of book-length journalism; many had written several (*Telling True Stories* 299-308). These figures suggest the practice of book-length journalism is more widespread than has been recognized.

Second, questions of ethics are inherent in the practice of journalism, regardless of the medium in which it is presented (Christians et al *Media Ethics* 2-3; Richards *Quagmires and Quandaries* Preface; Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 12). The documentary bears a similar relationship to television journalism that book-length journalism has to newspaper and magazine journalism, and the ethical issues faced by documentarians have been explored by scholars of the form (For examples, see Nichols “Why Are Ethical Issues Central to Documentary Filmmaking?” Williams “The Ethics of Intervention;” “Bernstein “Documentaphobia and Mixed Modes”). I choose to focus on book-length journalism in this thesis because while study of ethics in journalism is well developed according to an overview published in early 2009 by Lee Wilkins and Clifford Christians in *The Handbook of Mass Media Ethics*, relatively little attention has been paid to whether book-length journalism raises ethical issues particular to practice in that medium. For instance, how do practitioners balance their need to maintain editorial independence with the closeness to key sources that comes from gaining a deep level of trust? Are there any limits to the kinds of narrative approach practitioners can take when representing actual people and events? And, how do readers read journalism in books as distinct from in newspapers and magazines? If journalists present their book in a narrative mode, is their work read as non-fiction or, because it reads *like* a novel, is it read *as* a novel?

Scholars in the literary non-fiction, literary journalism and creative non-fiction fields certainly have not ignored ethical issues, but they examine them within the context of work that they argue is literary or artistic (Weber *The Literature of Fact* 43-55; Sims and Kramer *Literary Journalism* 3-34; Cheney *Writing Creative Nonfiction* 217-32;

Gutkind “The Creative Nonfiction Police?” xix-xxxiii). This leads to the third key issue, which is that by choosing to study journalism that is in their eyes literary or artistic, scholars blur the question of whether the ethical issues inherent in representing people and events in a narrative mode of writing are magnified or diminished by the practitioner’s literary or artistic skills, or whether it is in the initial taking of a narrative approach that the ethical issues are triggered. This issue is evident in the differing critical receptions to the work of Bob Woodward, a newspaper reporter who has become a prolific practitioner of book-length journalism, and Truman Capote, a novelist who wrote a “non-fiction novel.” Applegate includes both in his dictionary but where Capote is mentioned in twelve of the seventeen sources Applegate cites Woodward is mentioned by none of them (*Literary Journalism* xvii-xix). Rather, Applegate’s choice appears to be founded in equating the use of a narrative approach with literary or artistic merit. He writes that in *The Final Days* Woodward and his co-author Carl Bernstein “used dialogue, interior monologue, and candid description to depict characters, scenes, and emotions. The book was an example of literary journalism” (300).

Most scholars in the literary journalism, literary non-fiction, and creative non-fiction fields have shown less interest in book-length journalism that is not, in their eyes, literary. Woodward, who has made numerous important journalistic disclosures and sold more copies of his works of book-length journalism than perhaps any other journalist in the world (See Appendix A), has not been included in any of the seven major anthologies of what is termed either literary journalism (Sims; Sims and Kramer; Kerrane and Yagoda; Chance and McKeen) or creative non-fiction (Talese and Lounsberry; Gutkind; Williford and Martone). Woodward’s newspaper reports, co-written with Bernstein, on the implications of the break-in at the Watergate hotel in 1972, have, however, won a place in two anthologies of investigative or muckraking journalism (Serrin and Serrin *The Journalism That Changed America* 132-35; Shapiro *Shaking the Foundations* 368-76). The notion that ethical issues would be present in a work of book-length journalism acclaimed by many literary critics, namely Capote’s *In Cold Blood*, but not in the work of Woodward, whose books are excluded from literary journalism anthologies, is, plainly, nonsense.

What is less plain to all is how some scholars conflate taking a narrative approach with notions of literary or artistic merit, and how failing to examine the assumptions

underlying their choices leads to critical confusion. Questions about accuracy, invention and accountability to readers arise in the work of both Woodward and Capote, but where most reviewers debate Woodward's work on these grounds, fewer literary scholars take up the same issues in Capote's work, and a good number of them read *In Cold Blood* as if it is a novel (Heyne "Toward a Theory of Literary Nonfiction" 481). The sixteen works of book-length journalism that Woodward has written or co-authored have been assessed primarily on their merits as journalism. The pattern of reviews of Woodward's books has been to outline, and usually praise, the disclosures they contain and to raise questions about his reliance on anonymous sources and his use of an omniscient narrative voice. There have been major controversies about how he could know certain intimate details about Richard Nixon when the president never agreed to be interviewed by him or by his then colleague Bernstein for their book *The Final Days* (Havill *Deep Truth* 108-17; Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 144-49), about whether he made a serious error in *The Brethren* about a Supreme Court judge voting against one of his own judgements (Havill 128-35; Shepard 189-92) and about whether he invented a scene in which he managed to get past hospital security guards to interview Central Intelligence Agency director, William Casey, who was barely able to speak because of surgery to remove a cancerous growth (Havill 182-95; Shepard 232-35).

Capote certainly opens the door to misreadings by describing his book as a "non-fiction novel" but the sub-title "A True Account of a Multiple Murder and Its Consequences" and the numerous media interviews he gave attesting to the book's factual accuracy (Inge *Truman Capote: Conversations*) show he was not echoing the approach of early eighteenth century writers such as Daniel Defoe and Henry Fielding who described their novels *Robinson Crusoe* and *Joseph Andrews* as a "just history of fact" and "copied from the book of nature" respectively (Ricketson "True Stories" 152); nor was his sub-title playful, as is novelist Peter Carey's title of his reimagining of the story of Australian bushranger Ned Kelly, *True History of the Kelly Gang*, published in 2000. Phillip K. Tompkins challenged the factual accuracy of *In Cold Blood* in an article written for *Esquire* magazine after he visited Kansas to re-interview several of Capote's sources and examine the court record of the case central to the book. Tompkins' most serious charge is that Capote altered facts and quotations to substantially skew his portrait of one of the killers, Perry Smith,

making him look less like a cold-blooded murderer than a victim whose considerable potential had been crippled by a miserable childhood (“In Cold Fact” 171). A number of literary critics have cited Tompkins’ article and to my knowledge none has seriously contested its factual grounding but that does not necessarily diminish Capote’s book in their eyes. Melvin Friedman writes that he believes Capote “cheated” but the consequences are unimportant. “Despite the convincing claims of unreliability ... we must still believe in the essential authenticity and integrity of Capote’s account” but Friedman does not say why he or we should (Heyne 482). Discussing arguments that Capote had made factual errors about the basketball skills of one person portrayed in the book and the buyer of the beloved horse of one of the four murder victims, Chris Anderson writes: “Even fact is finally beyond certainty when the author is not inventing the story. Experience is too various and complex, too fine, to be represented completely in words” (Anderson *Style as Argument* 66). That may be right in the abstract, but does it mean the author of a work of book-length journalism need make no effort to verify the accuracy of their account? The scale of error is also important; the basketball skills of a peripheral person in the book is not a crucial fact but the sale of the horse is significant because Capote spends considerable space (*In Cold Blood* 77, 169-70, 223) showing Nancy Clutter’s fondness for her horse and how poignant it is that “Babe” was sold to a farmer from outside the county who “said he might use her for ploughing” (223). The horse was sold to a local man who treasured her, however, according to Tompkins (“In Cold Fact” 127).

The confusion, or what looks like tentativeness, about looking beyond the text to the actual people and events it concerns, extends even to those like Weber, author of three books about literary non-fiction, for whom the core “critical problem with literary non-fiction cast in the form of fiction is always credibility” and “the writer’s commitment to fact” (*The Literature of Fact* 53). Weber walks up to the abyss but then turns back:

Such inaccuracy, if it exists, is of course devastating. If Capote has distorted Perry’s character, the book is fatally weakened as a ‘true account.’ But most readers know nothing of the Clutter murders beyond what Capote relates and so are in no position to measure the book as Tompkins does. Even if they could, such detective work

might seem of small importance for the book patently reaches beyond its factual grounding to grasp the reader in the manner of the novel. It seeks to be, finally, a work of the literary imagination, and it is on this level that the reader can best measure it (74-75).

It is not at all clear why Weber prefers Capote's account over Tompkins's, which quotes extensively from official documents and from his interviews. Despite Weber's earlier assertions of the importance of credibility and a writer's commitment to fact, he lets Capote off the hook by invoking his artistry even though it is his artistry that appears to have caused the problem in the first place. Nor does Weber's invoking the work's artistry absolve Capote of his ethical responsibility to the actual people he writes about.

Even more puzzling is the approach of a prominent literary scholar, Wayne Booth, in his book entitled *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*; his primary aim is to "talk about stories in ethical terms, treating the characters in them and their makers as more like people than labyrinths, enigmas, or textual puzzles to be 'deciphered'" (x). Most of his study concerns fiction. Booth does briefly consider the boundary between fiction and non-fiction (16-17), and he discusses Norman Mailer's *The Executioner's Song*, a book about the execution of a convicted murderer, Gary Gilmore, that was published in 1979 and meets the definition in this thesis of book-length journalism. Mailer's work has been the subject of controversy; he called it a "factual account" and a "true life story" (*The Executioner's Song* 1053) but it won a Pulitzer prize for fiction, in 1980 (<http://www.pulitzer.org/bycat/Fiction>). Mailer has been criticized for muddying the line between documentation and the fiction-writer's invention (Hersey "The Legend on the License" 257-264), and for engaging in a confidence game that "dulls the reader's powers of discrimination and dims his sensitivity to deception" (Fishkin *From Fact to Fiction* 216). These would seem to be ethical issues of interest to Booth. Indeed, as someone originally from that part of Utah where much of what is described in *The Executioner's Song* takes place, Booth writes that he knows at first hand know "how misleading some of his portraits of the area and the people will be to readers who live elsewhere. And I fear the harm that his book will do to many of those who are caricatured in it, including [Gary] Gilmore's wife, children, and relatives" (210 footnote). Being misled in this way makes Booth think less of Mailer as a person but it is "in large part irrelevant to my

appraisal of the book as a narrative that I might recommend to one of my own friends” (210). This does not make much sense to me; if you think it is important to treat characters in works of fiction not as labyrinths or enigmas but more like people, why would you not extend similar, even stronger, care to actual people who are represented in works of non-fiction? If you can think less of a fiction-writer for misleading his readers, is that not an ethical evaluation?

Some critics are hostile to weighing the relationship between fact and fiction even in works of book-length journalism that make crystal clear they are to be read as journalism rather than as a novel. Phyllis Frus, discussing Janet Malcolm’s *The Journalist and the Murderer*, writes that Daniel Kornstein, the lawyer defending journalist Joe McGinniss in the civil suit brought by the convicted murderer Jeffrey MacDonald, contests the validity of Malcolm’s book on its facts and interpretation of legal issues:

This tradition of tedious recital of error has a long and dreary history There are numerous articles detailing what both Capote and Mailer invented surrounding their subjects [in *In Cold Blood* and *The Executioner’s Song*]; indeed at least one reviewer of true-crime nonfiction novels invariably feels obligated to set the record straight by pointing out false facts rather than reading carefully to note how the writer has made the material speak. As Malcolm says, ‘The material does not ‘speak for itself’” (*The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative* Endnote 257-58)

If Frus is referring to an unblinking belief in objective truth, then treating facts as so many sliding balls on an abacus is simplistic and probably tedious, but there are many shades of meaning between that and Frus’s argument that “unless the reader has firsthand knowledge of the subjects she has no way of knowing what is actual, unless it is verified by other narratives” (7). The material may not speak for itself, as she approvingly quotes Malcolm, but even careful readers can be flummoxed by omissions and errors in a work of literary non-fiction. Frus inadvertently impales her argument by drawing a conclusion about the murderer, MacDonald, from information in Malcolm’s book that Kornstein has contested, with evidence, in his

“tedious recital of error” (Frus 194; Kornstein 132-33; Ricketson, 2006, “Reassessing Janet Malcolm’s *The Journalist and the Murderer*” 219-28).

Assessing which of Kornstein or Malcolm’s evidence and argument is more persuasive requires further checking and verification. Frus may well be right to argue that the average reader has neither the time nor the direct experience to verify most of what is printed in works of book-length journalism but that prompts an important ethical issue that is examined in this thesis – what obligations do practitioners owe their readers? What is puzzling about scholars such as Frus, Friedman, Anderson, Weber, Booth and others (see, for example, Lounsberry *The Art of Fact* 192) is the disparity between the rigor and precision they apply to even the smallest details of their scholarship (and that of others), while appearing to have little interest or understanding of the importance of parallel practices of verification in book-length journalism, or, to use their term, literary non-fiction. It is a disparity that is rarely reflected upon in the literature about this field (Lehman *Matters of Fact* 25-26, 90). In no way am I suggesting precision in scholarship is unimportant, but am asking: if scholars believe it is important in scholarship, why would they take a different attitude toward representing people and events in journalism? Scholars in disciplines such as anthropology and sociology understand well the ethical issues inherent in their study of people, not least through the exhaustive procedures required by university ethics committees for researching “human subjects.” Scholars in literary studies usually deal with texts rather than people, which may go some way toward explaining this peculiar blind spot.

The impetus for this thesis comes from my dual experience as a journalist and journalism academic. From working in newsrooms and in magazine offices in Australia, I have experienced not only the tangible excitement and pleasures of journalism but the gap between the richness and variety of what I saw, heard and felt on the road and the narrowness and sameness of the form in which I was most often required to write – the hard news report. David Simon, a former crime reporter for *The Baltimore Sun*, who wrote a landmark work of book-length journalism, *Homicide: A Year On The Killing Streets*, and is now well known for creating an epic police drama for television, *The Wire*, expresses a similar view. “For four years I had written city murders in a cramped, two-dimensional way – filling the back columns of the metro section with the kind of journalism that reduces all human tragedy,

especially those with black or brown victims, to bland, bite-sized morsels” (*Homicide* 627). While I knew journalism could be written in ways other than the hard news report, it was only after I began teaching and studying journalism that I began to appreciate the depth of its history and just how supple and enlivening are the forms journalism can take. In recent years works of book-length journalism have provided some of the most intense, moving and enlightening reading experiences I have had.

Initially, I focused on Australian works of book-length journalism. This area of writing is being practiced in differing ways in other countries, such as Canada, Finland, Portugal, China, Slovenia and France as is evident from a survey of papers presented at the four annual conferences of the International Association of Literary Journalism Studies (www.ialjs.org), from recent scholarship (Fontana “Plunging into the Underground”) and from an award made since 2003 by the French quarterly publication, *Lettre Internationale* for “the art of reportage” (www.lettre-ulysses-award.org/html). Relatively few books from these countries have been translated into English – Polish journalist Ryszard Kapuscinski is one whose work has been – but there has been a long tradition of book-length journalism in England and especially in the United States, where the most substantial body of scholarly and professional literature has also been created (Hartsock 251-81; Sims, *True Stories* 341-75). Accordingly, the book-length journalism examined here comes primarily from the United States and Australia. As part of the research for this thesis, I devised a detailed questionnaire (See Appendix B) for semi-structured interviews with five Australian practitioners of book-length journalism: John Bryson, Helen Garner, Malcolm Knox, David Marr and Margaret Simons. The work of a sixth, Estelle Blackburn, was also examined but she was not interviewed as she has written a detailed account of how she produced a work of book-length journalism. A seventh practitioner, Chloe Hooper, whose book *The Tall Man* was published during the writing phase of the thesis, was also interviewed. The practitioners were chosen for several reasons: because they have produced landmark works or controversial works, because they have written both journalism and novels, because they have spent time reflecting on journalistic practice or for a combination of these reasons. What emerges from these interviews is valuable information about how the practitioners

researched and produced their work and useful reflections on the ethical issues they confronted.

The practitioners' experiences and my interviews with them supported a hypothesis I had that ethical issues arise throughout the process of producing book-length journalism, which prompted me to conceive of a framework through which to articulate and analyse them. The framework is built around the experience of the practitioner, beginning with how they research their subject, to how they represent in a book what they have found and on to the terms in which they offer their work to readers. The framework, then, is tripartite, taking in the research phase of the practitioner's project, the writing phase and the reception phase. Practitioners have ethical responsibilities to those they write about as well as those they write for, and these people – the book's subjects and its readers – are as valued in this framework as the practitioner. The tripartite framework sits alongside the work of Daniel Lehman, a journalist and, later, a literary academic, (*Matters of Fact* ix) whose scholarship I value both because he grounds his criticism in an explicit consideration of the ethical issues arising in literary non-fiction (42) and for the framework he has developed for understanding the complex series of relationships that exist in non-fiction: "writer (outside text) to event; writer (through text) to event; reader (outside text) to event; reader (through text) to event; event arbitrated by text; text arbitrated by event and interpreted by writer and reader" (36). Lehman writes that the "transaction among writer, reader, and subject forces the nonfictional narrative onto a multireferential plane that I would call 'implicated': a term I use for the sense that it has of one being 'deeply involved, even incriminated' in both history and text" (4). Through this framework, Lehman's goal is "to explore the ways in which truth matters even in deeply narrative representations of historical events and to examine nonfictional narrative over the edge of text and experience" (15). Lehman's framework is important for the breadth and depth of inter-relationships it envisages in literary non-fiction, but the tripartite framework I have developed revolves around the practitioner for two reasons. First, it is, I would argue, more accessible than Lehman's framework, making it more likely to take hold, especially among practitioners, and it is at this group, as much as the academy, that the work of this thesis is aimed. Second, the practitioner is central to production of a work of book-length journalism. All the Australian practitioners interviewed for this thesis initiated

the idea for their books whereas in newspapers and magazines it is as common for practitioners to be given an assignment as it is for them to initiate one (Personal interviews). Practitioners of book-length journalism work with publishers, editors, and publicists, but they generally enjoy more autonomy than the average newspaper or magazine journalist (Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 26-27).

To investigate the issues within this tripartite framework, I draw on theoretical approaches from a range of disciplines. First and foremost, there is journalism studies and within it applied ethics. The question of which ethical approach to draw on has been influenced by the extent to which the codes of ethics for journalists encompass issues arising in the practice of book-length journalism. The American Society of Newspaper Editors drafted the “Canons of Journalism” in 1923, which the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) adopted and, later, revised.

(<http://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp>). In Australia the first code of ethics for journalists was created in 1944 by the Australian Journalists Association, forerunner to the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance (MEAA) (Hurst and White *Ethics and the Australian News Media* 19-20). Both organizations have revised their codes of ethics, most recently in the mid-1990s. The SPJ’s code contains four overarching principles:

- Seek truth and report it
Journalists should be honest, fair and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information.
- Minimize harm
Ethical journalists treat sources, subjects and colleagues as human beings deserving of respect.
- Act independently
Journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public’s right to know.
- Be accountable.
Journalists are accountable to their readers, listeners, viewers and each other.

Standards of practice are outlined for each principle. There are seventeen for the first principle, eight for the second, seven for the third, and five for the final principle (Black, Steele and Barney *Doing Ethics in Journalism* 6-8). The MEAA’s code contains twelve practice standards compared to the SPJ’s thirty-seven, but does offer a guidance clause at the end: “Basic values often need interpretation and sometimes

come into conflict. Ethical journalism requires conscientious decision-making in context. Only substantial advancement of the public interest or risk of substantial harm to people allows any standard to be overridden.” (<http://www.alliance.org.au>). In neither the United States nor Australia is membership of the SPJ or MEAA universal or even predominant among practitioners; nor are the codes enforceable on them (Wilkins and Christians *Handbook of Media Ethics* 20-21; Richards *Quagmires and Quandaries* 48-68). This does not mean the codes are without weight but it does provide some context for understanding debates prompted by the New Journalism in the 1960s and 1970s that are discussed in chapter two. These debates arose well before the *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* began in 1985 (Wilkins and Christians 24) or before publication of the SPJ’s first handbook on journalism ethics, in 1993 (Black, Steele and Barney Acknowledgments).

Even in their revised form the American and Australian codes of ethics were drafted for daily journalism; a number of members of both organizations write book-length journalism, however. The principles espoused in the two codes are endorsed by the six Australian practitioners interviewed for this thesis except for Bryson who is chary of professional codes of behaviour (Personal interview) and by nineteen leading American practitioners interviewed by Boynton for *The New New Journalism*, except Jon Krakauer who strongly argues the blanket prohibition on paying sources is inappropriate in book-length journalism (169). The codes contain what might be termed necessary but insufficient advice for practitioners of book-length journalism. The SPJ code urges journalists not to re-enact news without labelling it as such but it is referring there to the use of actors who play the role of an actual person in the news. The MEAA code does urge journalists to attribute information to its source, but it does not appear to encase the particular ethical issues arising from balancing the readability of a book written in a narrative mode with the demands of attribution. The SPJ code does ask journalists to avoid misrepresenting sources when quoting them, but provides no further detail to guide journalists who gather material over an extended period and need to consider how to ethically compress and select it for a book rather than a news report.

Questions to do with, say, whether a journalist can write an interior monologue for one of their sources are simply not envisaged in the two codes. On the relationship between journalists and their sources clause eight of the MEAA code says journalists

should use fair, responsible and honest means to obtain material and should identify themselves and their employer before obtaining any interview for publication, which is a well accepted requirement but to the practitioner of book-length journalism, what happens *after* the initial contact is the more pressing, and, complicated issue. Both codes cover the problems of using anonymous sources and in the third edition of the SPJ's handbook on ethical issues, published in 1997, it is briefly acknowledged that the use of anonymous sources is not the only difficulty in the journalist-source relationship. The handbook's authors describe the journalist-source relationship as "tenuous" but beyond advising "The bottom line is a warning to keep a professional distance or to behave so honourably during the interviewing and the writing that sources are not deceived" they have no more to say (Black, Steele and Barney 264-65).

The SPJ code's first two principles – seek truth and report it and minimize harm – certainly make explicit both the ideal goal of journalism and also the possibility that even the ethical practice of journalism may damage people and organizations. For practitioners of projects that may well live on bookshelves for years rather than be thrown into the recycle bin at the end of the day, it is salutary to keep in mind the tension existing in these principles. The MEAA's guidance clause acknowledging that applied ethics requires "conscientious decision-making in context" is particularly relevant for journalism practice that takes place over months or even years. But I will argue that the particular ethical issues arising in the practice of book-length journalism cannot be fully worked through simply by referring to the American and Australian codes of ethics. Similarly, the leading textbooks in journalism ethics are also primarily aimed at the practice of daily journalism. They survey both the advances and the limitations of seminal traditions in philosophy, whether Kant's "categorical imperative," utilitarianism as developed by Bentham and, later, Mill, or other approaches espoused by Aristotle, Confucius, Hume and Rawls, among others (Christians et al *Media Ethics* 11-19; Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 14-26; Smith *Groping for Ethics in Journalism* 41-57). They then draw on whichever traditions singly or in combination are most helpful in examining ethical issues such as bias and conflicts of interest (Cohen and Elliott *Journalism Ethics* 54-72, 91-96), the impact of new technologies and the tension between an individual journalist's ethics and their employer's corporate interests (Richards *Quagmires and Quandaries* 69-

110). I will be drawing on these applications of various philosophical traditions but will put more weight on Aristotelian virtue ethics.

After being widely regarded in the twentieth century as the least important ethical tradition of thought, virtue ethics has been revived in recent decades at least partly because it considers matters neglected in other traditions such as happiness, character and the development of emotions in moral life (Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 32). Virtues are not simply tendencies to act in particular ways. As Rosalind Hursthouse puts it: “Each of the virtues involves getting things right, for each involves *phronesis*, or practical wisdom, which is the ability to reason correctly about practical matters” (*On Virtue Ethics* 12). In *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles*, Oakley and Cocking have developed a cogent argument for applying the theory of virtue ethics to professions, in particular medicine and the law, that offers a template to be extrapolated to the ethical issues arising in the practice of book-length journalism. They begin by noting that many proponents of virtue ethics have not been sufficiently precise in bringing out the distinctive elements of the theory. This may be because they have been preoccupied with showing how virtue ethics counters perceived shortcomings of standard Kantian and utilitarian theories (*Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles* 8) or because Aristotle himself did not fully tease out the relationship between virtue and well-being (Honderich *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* 55). To say it is a theory grounded in the importance of a person’s character is not enough to distinguish it from recent developments in Kantian and utilitarian thinking, according to Oakley and Cocking, who develop six essential features of virtue ethics. Some of these elements are present in other ethical theories but taken together the six elements make it a distinctive theory. They are:

- a) An action is right if and only if it is what an agent with a virtuous character would do in the circumstance
- b) Goodness is prior to rightness
- c) The virtues are irreducibly plural intrinsic goods
- d) The virtues are objectively good
- e) Some intrinsic goods are agent-relative
- f) Acting rightly does not require that we maximize the good (9-25).

Oakley and Cocking tie their six essential features of virtue ethics to what they term a “regulative ideal,” which is a “certain conception of correctness or excellence” (25) that a person internalizes so that they can adjust their motivation and conduct to

meet, or at least not contradict, the regulative ideal. The guiding notion of virtue ethics is eudaimonia, or living a flourishing life, in a way that exemplifies core virtues such as friendship, courage and integrity. Virtue ethics is often criticized, Oakley and Cocking acknowledge, for being vague about the nature of particular virtues and for being circular: “is it possible to establish what a virtuous agent would be like without knowing what actions are right?” (32). Virtue ethics does not offer an “algorithm” of right action, as Aristotle put it (32), but Oakley and Cocking argue “virtue ethicists often give considerable detail about what virtuous agents have done and would do in certain situations, and these details can help us to identify what it is right to do in a particular situation” (33).

Moving from the general to the specific, Oakley and Cocking focus on how virtue ethics applies to professional roles. Professions are established with a purpose and a set of goals that sits well with the notion in virtue ethics that “Virtues are those qualities the possession of which allow one to achieve one’s telos or end,” according to Sanders (*Ethics & Journalism* 33). A good profession is one that is committed to a central human good, and the purpose of doctors to serve human health and of lawyers to serve justice are clearly important virtues. A virtue ethics approach enables us to track back and forth between general ethical theories pertaining to humankind and those particular to the practice of certain professions. Conversely, what Oakley and Cocking term universalist and impartialist utilitarian or Kantian ethical theories, struggle to accommodate “various values thought distinctive of certain professional roles” (95).

Examining ethical issues within the field of medicine, Oakley and Cocking reject an argument put by Charles Fried that the doctor-patient relationship “is analogous to the personal relations cases of friendship and love” (98). Instead they argue that similar to friendship – but not to impartialist ethical models of relations between persons – there is an important element of “agent-relative” value in the regulative ideals governing good doctors.

The concern for the particular and concrete individuals a doctor treats, will we believe, significantly shape the nature of the concern a good doctor has for their patients. Such agent-relative reasons or values,

however, are best conceived as agent-relative to the agent *qua doctor*, and not to the agent *qua friend* (99).

Oakley and Cocking's close attention to the interplay between general ethical theories and particular professional circumstances is evident in their analysis of the issue of professional detachment. They begin with Aristotle's notion of psychic harmony, in which people's beliefs, desires and emotions are in harmony. At the opposite end, Aristotle writes, people's souls are "rent by faction" and "to be thus is the height of wretchedness" (139). They outline four cases of professional detachment concerning an intensive care nurse looking after critically ill patients, a barrister defending known criminals, an insurance company's lawyer disillusioned by needing to act against innocent claimants and a prostitute concerned about the need for and cost of remaining aloof from her clients (141-42). In each case there is a conflict between the emotions an ordinary person might feel in these circumstances – for instance, compassion for a dying person – and the needs of the profession. Oakley and Cocking argue the psychic cost of detachment must be measured against the extent to which it serves the profession's goals, and whether the particular goals of the profession are worthwhile. The intensive care nurse and barrister meet these tests, though not without qualification, but the insurance company's lawyer is being asked to act unethically continuously and, argue Oakley and Cocking, the prostitute's work is not unambiguously serving "a humanly flourishing life" (148).

Oakley and Cocking's work concentrates on medicine and law because they are important and longstanding professions; they mention journalism only once, in the context of it being, along with accountancy and architecture, a newer profession "whose goals are arguably less central to human flourishing than are the goals of the medical and legal professions" (80). To exclude these newer professions from a virtue ethics framework would be overly moralistic; instead, Oakley and Cocking suggest that a profession's core goals need not be vital to human flourishing but that the goals are morally permissible (80). Whether journalism is a profession or a craft is a matter of debate; the practice of journalism has some of the qualities associated with professions, but not all (Richards *Quagmires and Quandaries* 2-4). The label may be less important, according to members of the committee that reviewed Australian journalists' code of ethics in the 1990s, than "that journalists exercise

power, do work that has a potential for harm or good, serve a public purpose, and must be accountable” (*Ethics in Journalism* 4).

A virtue ethics approach of the kind outlined by Oakley and Cocking lends itself to the practice of book-length journalism for several reasons. First, practitioners enjoy greater autonomy than their counterparts in newspapers and magazines and so rely more on their own resources to resolve ethical issues – or are forced to do so. A proportion of practitioners of daily journalism have always treated codes of ethics as sets of strictures to be finessed but this attitude risks unravelling in book-length journalism where practitioners are independent authors rather than employees of media companies. Aaron Quinn argues that the longstanding reliance in daily journalism on externally imposed institutional norms and codes of ethics can be strengthened by “an internalized moral psychology for journalists based on virtue” (“Moral Virtues for Journalists” 168). He argues the application of virtue ethics in daily journalism does not mean rejecting various useful mechanisms for external regulation but can be a “foundational complement” for them (168). Externally imposed norms and codes are less in evidence for practitioners of book-length journalism, which magnifies the need for internalized moral psychology grounded in virtue.

Second, one of Aristotle’s central insights is that experience engenders moral wisdom. Practical wisdom and a virtuous character go hand in hand. As Sanders puts it: “Practical intelligence without virtue is mere cunning and a stupid, good person is not virtuous at all. The role of judgement is crucial because circumstances play their part in deciding what is virtuous behaviour” (34). The practice of book-length journalism demands more advanced skills in research and writing than most newspaper and magazine journalism, which means practitioners in this field are usually experienced; among Boynton’s nineteen interviewees, their average age on publication of their first work of book-length journalism was thirty-four. The comparable figure for the Australians discussed in chapter three is just over forty, though I acknowledge these figures are suggestive rather than comprehensive. Third, most print journalism is produced in the crush of continual, unyielding deadlines; book-length journalism, for the most part, is focused but not driven by deadlines. There is more time for practitioners to resolve ethical issues. Virtue ethics concentrates less, argues Meilaender, on “whether we should frame one innocent

man to save five – but on the virtue of justice, with its steady, habitual determination to make space in life for the needs and claims of others” (*The Theory and Practice of Virtue* 5). Virtue ethics, then, puts less emphasis on extreme cases and on duty. “*Being* not *doing* takes centre stage; for what we ought to do may depend on the sort of person we are” (6).

Throughout the thesis, I draw on practitioners’ reflections, both from the Australians already mentioned and others, notably American practitioners interviewed by Robert Boynton for his book, *The New New Journalism: Conversations with America’s Best Nonfiction Writers on Their Craft*. Boynton is a journalist and journalism academic whose work has been published in magazines such as *Harpers* and *The New Yorker* and who is director of New York University’s magazine journalism program. Published in 2005, *The New New Journalism* includes interviews with nineteen leading practitioners, all of whom have written at least one work of book-length journalism and most of whom have written several. They are: Ted Conover, Richard Ben Cramer, Leon Dash, William Finnegan, Jonathan Harr, Alex Kotlowitz, Jon Krakauer, Jane Kramer, William Langewiesche, Adrian Nicole LeBlanc, Michael Lewis, Susan Orlean, Richard Preston, Ron Rosenbaum, Eric Schlosser, Gay Talese, Calvin Trillin, Lawrence Weschler and Lawrence Wright.

Boynton’s comprehensive interviews – the book runs to nearly five hundred pages – explore a range of topics, from how practitioners generate ideas, how they gather material and how they write as well as ethical issues such as how they gain access to the people they write about and the nature of the relationship they form with them. Preceding each interview is an introduction to the practitioner, including critical reception to their works, but Boynton does not offer his own assessments beyond what is implicit in the book’s sub-title. Nor does he analyse what his interviewees have told him. Boynton’s lengthy introduction to the volume (xi-xxxii) is aimed at locating his chosen practitioners in the history of American journalism rather than espousing a particular approach to the ethical issues discussed by the practitioners. The interviews in *The New New Journalism*, then, are a rich source of primary material for this thesis not simply because of the interviewees’ candour but because their reflections epitomise the value of Aristotle’s practical wisdom in action. Their insights are analysed and set in the tripartite framework developed in this thesis.

Several other theoretical approaches have been valuable in analysing works of book-length journalism within the tripartite framework. They will be discussed in more detail later, but, briefly, for the research phase of book-length journalism, I draw on literature about anthropology and the relationships fieldworkers develop with those they study. Concerning the writing phase of book-length journalism, I draw on literary studies, and within it, narrative studies. Apart from Lehman's work, I found Lubomír Doložel's use of possible worlds semantics helpful in understanding the boundaries between what he calls fictional and factual narrative ("Fictional and Historical Narrative" 247-73). Concerning the relationship practitioners seek to establish with their audience and readers' expectations of book-length journalism, I draw on publishing studies and narrative studies, especially Gérard Genette's work on the paratext in his book of the same name. I will also draw on readings of a range of book-length journalism, including not only Australian works but up to a further one hundred books, some of them such as George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London* written early in the twentieth century, but the majority of them published in recent decades. I offer close readings of two landmark works of book-length journalism, namely Capote's *In Cold Blood*, published in January 1966 (Clarke *Too Brief a Treat* 467; De Bellis "Visions and Revisions" 519)), and Woodward and Bernstein's *The Final Days*, published in 1976. *In Cold Blood* was originally published in *The New Yorker* magazine over four consecutive weeks in late 1965 (*The Complete New Yorker* Disk 4); several other well-known works of book-length journalism likewise originally appeared in magazines, but I will be citing the published books in this thesis unless it is relevant to refer to the original publications. Citations for *In Cold Blood* are from the first hardback edition published in London by Hamish Hamilton, whose pagination differs from the first edition published in New York by Random House (De Bellis "Visions and Revisions" 519-36); I have had access to the former but not the latter.

In Cold Blood is an account of the apparently senseless murder of four members of a farming family, the Clutters, in Holcomb, Kansas, in 1959 by two drifters, Perry Smith and Richard Hickock, and of their subsequent capture, conviction and execution. The account of the murders is shocking to read but the book depicts them as an example of life in America rather than as extraordinary for the nature of the crime, as in, say, the Jack the Ripper case, or the notoriety of those involved, as in

the O.J. Simpson trial. Conversely, *The Final Days* deals with historically important events, namely how President Richard Nixon and his most senior aides tried unsuccessfully to cover-up their involvement in the break-in during the early hours of 17 June 1972 of the Democratic Party campaign headquarters at the Watergate hotel-office-apartment complex by five men carrying equipment to copy documents and plant electronic listening devices. *The Final Days* is a reconstruction of the administration's downfall, culminating on 9 August 1974 when Nixon became the first American president to be forced to resign from office. Woodward and Bernstein were journalists at *The Washington Post* who had led their competitors in reporting that the burglars were engaged in a political dirty tricks campaign authorized by the White House. Their first book, *All the President's Men*, published on 17 June 1974, the second anniversary of the burglary (Havill *Deep Truth* 91), recounts how the two young reporters broke the story

In Cold Blood and *The Final Days* have been chosen for several reasons: first, they were commercially successful and prompted both lavish praise and sharp criticism on publication (Clarke *Capote* 355-65; Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 142-49); second, Capote and Woodward and Bernstein's work was recognized in the New York University Journalism department's list of the Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century (See Appendix C); third, because where Capote came to his project from a background as a novelist with openly literary aims, Woodward and Bernstein were daily journalists who came to writing books from their newspaper work; fourth because Capote and Woodward and Bernstein have attracted a sizeable literature, and finally because there is primary source material available for Capote in the form of his papers held at the New York Public Library. In addition, many of his letters have been published by his biographer, Gerald Clarke, in *Too Brief a Treat*, but to my knowledge they have so far escaped scholarly attention even though the letters offer important insights into Capote's approach to ethical issues that arose for him while working on *In Cold Blood*.

Woodward and Bernstein have sold their Watergate reporting and book-writing materials to the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas. They offer useful insight into their work methods. But Woodward and Bernstein's interview notes with sources are available only after the sources have died, which curtails scholars' ability to compare how they handled material provided by their many anonymous sources

with the published book

(<http://www.hrc.utexas.edu/research/fa/woodstein.scope.html>;

<http://www.hrc.utexas.edu/research/fa/woodstein.series.html>;

Email inquiry with Caitlin Murray, Harry Ransom Center archivist). In lieu of that I have drawn on the work of a scholar, Alicia Shepard, who examined the Watergate papers in detail for a joint biography of Woodward and Bernstein published in 2007. I intend focusing on Woodward's work rather than his collaboration with Bernstein because it is Woodward rather than Bernstein who has become such a prominent figure and because the main ethical issues arising in their book-length journalism are more evident in Woodward's work. These issues begin with *The Final Days* in which Woodward's particular research method and writing style is established, and have since remained largely unchanged. Bernstein's name is listed second on the book's cover because he wrote less than twenty-five per cent of it; the two names are listed alphabetically on the cover of *All the President's Men* because their contribution to that project was equal (Havill *Deep Truth* 110). Since *The Final Days*, Woodward and Bernstein have not written any more books together, but where Woodward has been prolific (14 more books as of early 2009), Bernstein has been sporadic (three books). In general I will be focusing on practitioners rather than the publishers, editors, designers and publicists they work with. I acknowledge the role of these people – Woodward's longtime editor, Alice Mayhew, has been influential in developing his style (Havill 88; Shepard 129, 245-46) – but it is beyond the scope of this thesis.

The purpose of this first chapter has been to re-frame the critical debate about an area of writing practice that goes by a variety of names but which I want to call book-length journalism so as to draw attention to it being a part of journalism and to ask a series of questions that have been blurred or hidden from plain view by the emphasis in much scholarly literature on the literary or artistic merit of this field. In particular, I want to foreground the particular ethical issues that surface when journalism is practiced at book-length. The plan of the thesis is that I begin by outlining the scope of book-length journalism and what I believe is valuable about it as an activity. I move to a consideration of the experience of leading Australian practitioners before articulating the tripartite framework for book-length journalism. Over three chapters devoted to the three parts of the framework, I analyse a range of works of book-

length journalism, before providing a brief conclusion. A summary of the chapters follows.

In chapter two, “The nature and range of book-length journalism,” I show how this area of writing practice is not well recognized. It shares common goals and methods with print journalism and non-fiction books, both of which are well recognized fields, but book-length journalism it is not readily identified as or in either field. Building on scholars’ work in the literary journalism and literary non-fiction fields, I list six elements of book-length journalism and discuss how they resemble and where they differ from newspaper and magazine journalism and non-fiction book-writing. They are: the subject-matter is about actual events, issues and people; extensive research; a narrative approach; a range of authorial voices; underlying meaning, and impact. Having done this, it is possible to identify a substantial body of work produced since at least late in the nineteenth century that has been well received critically, commercially and has made a powerful impact on generations of readers. Several landmark works of book-length journalism have remained in print many years after their initial topicality has passed and some have been included in the western literary canon. Acknowledging the contingent nature of canons, I also show the apparently disproportionate representation of works of book-length journalism in canons of journalism created in the United States and Australia. The chapter then outlines what I argue is valuable about book-length journalism as a writing practice, including the kind of information it puts before readers, which may be revelatory, or open up parts of the world unknown to the general reader, the degree to which the book is able to move beyond the necessarily superficial nature of daily journalism and explore the complexity of an issue, the use of a narrative approach that can create a deep level of engagement with the reader, and the appeal of particular individual journalists’ prose style.

In chapter three, “Australian practitioners’ experience of book-length journalism,” I argue that practice of book-length journalism in Australia is considerably more developed than the scholarship surrounding it. Following a model created by an American scholar, I compile a list of notable works of book-length journalism produced by Australian practitioners to show that the body of such work is more substantial than has been recognized. I also develop a detailed questionnaire about ethical issues arising in book-length journalism to conduct interviews with a small

number of leading Australian practitioners whose work and whose views about their own work have received little or no scholarly attention. All six works examined in this chapter were either critically or commercially successful or made a significant impact on public debate and perceptions. They are: Bryson's re-investigation and reconstruction of the murder case against Lindy Chamberlain in *Evil Angels*, Garner's controversial account of a sexual harassment case at a university college, *The First Stone*, Blackburn's remarkable work *Broken Lives* that was important in overturning two men's wrongful convictions for murder, Marr and Wilkinson's forensic re-examination in *Dark Victory* of the Howard coalition government's response to an influx of asylum-seekers shortly before a federal election, Simons' investigation of the Hindmarsh Island bridge affair in *Meeting of the Waters*, and Knox's inquiry into the inner workings of the jury system in *Secrets of the Jury Room*. Examining these works prompts a series of complex ethical issues that to a greater or lesser extent the practitioners struggled to come to terms with in their works and in the interviews. These include: is it possible to write in an omniscient narrative voice, as Bryson does, or is omniscience incompatible with book-length journalism? Does it matter whether people read a work of book-length journalism as fiction, as some do with *The First Stone*? And, when practitioners attempt to write interior monologue, as Blackburn does, to what extent is their success determined by the subject of the monologue and to what extent does it flow from the individual practitioner's writing ability?

In chapter four, "Ethical issues arising in researching book-length journalism," I show how important it is in assessing the value of a work of book-length journalism to understand how what is in a text came to be there. My focus is on the particular ways that ethical issues arise in book-length as compared to newspaper and magazine journalism. The most distinctive and difficult issue for practitioners stems from their need, for many projects, to develop a close and trusting relationship with key people in the event or issue they are researching and about whom they will write in the narrative mode. A reading of literature about anthropology prods practitioners to consider the implications of shedding their status as observers and becoming participant-observers. With this in mind, I draw on a virtue ethics approach to track back and forth between the needs of the professional roles adopted by practitioners and the personal, friend-like relationship they may form with principal sources. The

ethical issues are discussed through close readings of three works of book-length journalism – Malcolm’s *The Journalist and the Murderer*, *In Cold Blood* and *The Final Days* – and from leading practitioners’ reflections. Malcolm opens up the Macdonald vs. McGinniss lawsuit in uniquely interesting ways but she also distorts its facts. Capote becomes deeply confused about the boundaries between personal involvement and professional distance in his long-term engagement with Perry Smith. Woodward imports from newspaper to book-length journalism a complex and troublesome practice – the use of anonymous sources – without thinking through whether it is applicable or whether he can ameliorate its difficulties by using other research methods. Where Malcolm characterizes the journalist-source relationship as inescapably enacting a pattern of seduction and betrayal, other leading practitioners know that may have happened with some colleagues but that it does not have to. In their conscientious application of practical wisdom to their experience journalists can enter into and maintain an ethical relationship with principal sources that takes on elements of ethnography such as informed consent and that continues common journalistic understandings of editorial independence.

In chapter five, “Ethical issues arising in representing people, events and issues in book-length journalism,” my focus is primarily on book-length journalism written in a narrative rather than expository mode as the former is more widely practiced and as it raises more pressing ethical problems. I show the dangers of scholars and practitioners conflating notions of narrative, fiction and literariness. I draw on Doložel’s application of possible worlds semantics to find and understand the boundaries between fiction and non-fiction. For practitioners writing in a narrative mode, there is an inherent tension between their commitment to veracity and their desire to engage readers as fully as possible. I argue that the ethical issues of representation in this area are all seen through this prism. The issues are sparked by the taking of a narrative approach rather than by the individual practitioner’s literary ability, as shown in my discussion of a journeyman writer such as Woodward and an unquestioned prose stylist such as Capote. Unlike a number of scholars, I argue that the relationship between the practitioner’s research work and their writing may be more significant than their individual literary ability. Both Woodward and Capote’s ethical problems began in the research phase and were aggravated in the writing phase of their works. By examining various elements of representing people and

events in a narrative mode, it becomes clear that the omniscient narrative voice is particularly fraught in book-length journalism because it offers a knowingness that is all but impossible to achieve, but that unbridled subjectivity also has serious shortcomings. Observing and describing people and events raises manageable ethical issues for practitioners, while reconstructing scenes creates thorny issues, and the interior monologue thornier still. I show how these problems can be resolved or managed when practitioners both understand and accept the limitations of book-length journalism as a narrative writing practice as well as its still extensive possibilities.

In chapter six, “Ethical issues arising in practitioners’ relationship with readers of book-length journalism,” the nature of the relationship that practitioners seek to create with readers is examined. Some liken the relationship to a “contract” while others have invoked consumer protection laws, but another scholar offers a useful framework that draws on both legal and ethical concepts to describe a continuum along which the twin elements of veracity and narrative mode are placed. In the absence of comprehensive empirical data, I offer an insight into the grounds on which practitioners offer their works to reader through an analysis of dust-jacket promotional copy for works of book-length journalism. Practitioners want readers to engage in a rich reading experience and writing in a narrative mode is how they can achieve this. Practitioners aiming to represent events as they are can induce in readers what is called a fiction dream state, which creates an ethical issue because what works well in fiction is open to manipulation in book-length journalism. Book-length journalism is predicated on an understanding that what is offered is a representation of actual events, but if the book looks like a novel and reads like a novel, there is a danger readers will read it as if it is a novel. Practitioners therefore need to consider how they can give readers both a compelling reading experience and the ability to weigh the work’s truth-telling claims. Trust between practitioners and readers is therefore critical but what is needed is not blind trust but what I term an informed trust that practitioners can inculcate through their narrative voice in the body of the work or in the paratext through elements such as endnotes, notes to the reader and bibliographies. The problems Woodward and Capote created for themselves in the writing phase of their works were aggravated by the scant means they gave readers to assess their book’s truth-telling claims. Later practitioners have

become more mindful of the nature of the power relations operating between practitioners and their readers, and make greater use of explanatory devices that serve their role in disclosing information as well as their role as storytellers.

CHAPTER TWO: THE NATURE AND RANGE OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM

Not to be too grand about it, but a book ought to alter the reader's life, add to the reader's life, in some fundamental way. You have a compact with the reader that if he gives you the time then something will be better for him. His understanding will increase, an emotional satisfaction will ensue, a cathartic experience will take place. A book has to make something happen. A newspaper story informs, a magazine article entertains, and a book has to move you.

Richard Ben Cramer (*The New New Journalism* 50-51).

To highlight the medium and scope of what is termed in this thesis book-length journalism is to explicitly locate it in the field of journalism practice. The term book-length journalism is not a common one but an early use of it in the academic literature was in 1986 by communications and journalism scholar James Carey.

Journalism must be examined as a corpus, not as a set of isolated stories. The corpus includes not only the multiple treatments of an event within the newspaper – breaking stories, follow-ups, news analysis, interpretation and background, critical commentary, editorials – but also the other forms of journalism that surround, correct and complete the daily newspaper: television coverage, documentary and docudrama, the newsweeklies and journals of opinion and, finally, book-length journalism (“Dark Continent” 151)

Nearly a decade later Michael Schudson used the term in a review of a book about the media's role in an information age (“Too Much Democracy?” 62). Both use it as a way of signalling that the range of journalistic practice is far broader than the hard news report, where the most important piece of information is put first followed by

data in descending order of importance (Stephens *A History of News* 241-44). It is news published in this form that occupies so much scholarly attention as Zelizer notes in her overview of media scholarship, *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy*, published in 2004 (6-7). However, Carey writes, journalists devote much of their attention to “keeping significant issues afloat long enough so that interpretation, explanation, and thick description can be added as part of ongoing development” which is where book-length work plays an important role (151).

It is not necessary to demonstrate the importance of journalism to a democratic society as there is already a sizeable literature devoted to that topic that has been well summarized by Zelizer and been reaffirmed in a volume of the Institutions of American Democracy series, *The Press*, published in 2005, that gathers new essays by media scholars. This, of course, does not mean journalism is an untrammelled good. There is a sizeable literature about the various functions of the news media and about how what is known as the fourth estate model accounts for only part of what the news media does in a democratic society (Stephens *A History of News* 183-201; Richards *Quagmires and Quandaries* 69-98), about how the news media’s entertainment role threatens to swamp its public service role (Schultz, *Reviving the Fourth Estate* 230-32), about how, the internet notwithstanding, the highly concentrated ownership of news media around the world reduces the plurality of voices heard in public debates (Simons, *The Content Makers* 323-46) and most recently about how the business model that has underwritten well-resourced newsrooms is threatened by cheap or free advertising online (Ricketson “The Dearth Estate: A Question of Quality”). Journalism, too, is practiced in differing ways in differing democracies as well as in societies operating under other political systems that may be indifferent or even hostile to the idea of the news media acting as a watchdog (McKenzie “Philosophies for Media Systems” 71-87; McKenzie “News Reporting” 249-302).

To research and write ethically about actual events and people requires a rationale or a justification because inherent in such work is invading people’s privacy, asking them searching questions and writing about them in ways they may not agree with or may find uncomfortable, offensive or even entirely objectionable. The most compelling justification is that the journalist is acting in the public interest; that is, they are examining issues that are relevant and, in some cases, important to a

democratic society. The more widespread the practice of book-length journalism as a field, the more urgent is the need to delineate and discuss its particular ethical issues. The term book-length journalism, inevitably, excludes as well as includes. It suggests a clear distinction exists between journalism written for newspapers, journalism written for magazines and that published in books. There are differences but there are also similarities; it is preferable in my view to see journalism practiced in the three print forms existing along a continuum. That enables us to see there are also points on the continuum at which book-length journalism intersects with other kinds of books that, like journalism, are about actual people and events, and points at which it diverges too.

The backdrop against which this area of writing practice sits is the New Journalism, which is one of the profusion of terms discussed in the previous chapter. Its importance here is that its arrival in the United States in the early 1960s provoked fierce debates about the nature of journalism that in turn has prompted extensive scholarship (Hartsock *A History of American Literary Journalism* 253-55) and reflection by practitioners (Boynton *The New New Journalism*; Kramer and Call *Telling True Stories*). The New Journalism, which is broadly defined as practitioners taking a narrative approach to researching and writing about actual people and events, was practiced primarily in magazines such as *Esquire* and *New York*, and at book-length, in, notably, Capote's *In Cold Blood*, Hunter S. Thompson's *Hell's Angels*, Wolfe's *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* and Norman Mailer's *The Armies of the Night* (Sims *True Stories* 219-62; Weingarten *From Hipster to Gonzo: How New Journalism Rewrote the World*). Wolfe, the chief advocate and best known practitioner of New Journalism, introduced an anthology of journalistic pieces entitled *The New Journalism* with a lengthy essay outlining the characteristics of what he believed was a new genre set to not only revolutionize journalism but dethrone the novel as "literature's main event" ("The New Journalism" 22). He listed four writing devices normally associated with fiction that were used by New Journalists: constructing the article or book as a series of scenes, using dialogue rather than quotations from interviewees, narrating from various points of view, whether the journalist or the people being written about, and even as an interior monologue, and recording status details (35, 46-7).

Wolfe's arguments, which he reprised in a later article after he began writing novels ("Stalking the Billion-Footed Beast" vii-xxx), have been picked apart as overstated or skewed by scholars who showed how he substantially undervalued the importance of journalism produced at *The New Yorker* (Sims *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century* 104-07), by those who argue that "Wolfe's concern was less with the history of the genre than the future of his career" (Boynton *The New New Journalism* xix) and by those who argue he writes questionable literary history but a "lively piece of self-advertisement" (Bradbury *The Modern American Novel* 264). Wolfe's preoccupation with status and power relations in groups is evident in much of his journalism and is revealed in his anxiety to promote the New Journalism as an activity that necessarily had to displace fiction rather than co-exist with it. Wolfe's essay remains required reading for any scholar in this field, however, partly because of his insights into the implications of writing about actual events and people in a narrative mode and partly because of the sheer verve of his prose. Wolfe may be a shameless self-promoter, but there is little doubt many works written in the New Journalism style were far more enjoyable to read than standard newspaper and magazine journalism and that works by Wolfe, Mailer, Thompson, Joan Didion and others made a significant cultural and political impact (Hartsock *A History of American Literary Journalism* 191-203). Practitioners of New Journalism, many of whom were young, agitated against what they saw as hidebound newsroom structures. They wanted to throw open the range of topics journalists could write about, as well how they wrote about them (Pauly "The Politics of the New Journalism" 110-29). Didion and Mailer explicitly questioned what they saw as simplistic notions of factual accuracy and argued objective news reports hide as much as they reveal (*Slouching Towards Bethlehem* 11-13; *The Armies of the Night* 4). Thompson commented while covering the 1972 presidential campaign: "The only thing I ever saw that came close to Objective Journalism was a closed-circuit TV setup that watched shoplifters in the General Store at Woody Creek, Colorado. I always admired that machine, but I noticed that nobody paid much attention to it" (*Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72* 44). Belief in factual accuracy and objectivity have been central to the news media's self-image since early in the twentieth century according to Mitchell Stephens (*A History of News* 253-57). The New Journalism posed a threat to the prevailing belief in objective journalism;

attacking the New Journalism's status as journalism, therefore, was a potent weapon (Pauly "The Politics of the New Journalism" 114-15).

The New Journalism was not a movement in any formal sense; even Wolfe recognized that any title containing the word new was destined to be consigned to "the garbage barge of history" ("The New Journalism" 37). Not surprisingly, various practitioners differed in their views on what they were doing, which provided ammunition for the media establishment. Wolfe and Talese both emphasized that their journalism may have read like a novel but it was exhaustively reported and founded in fact (Wolfe "The New Journalism" 49; Talese *Fame and Obscurity* vii). For much of the New Journalists' work this claim has held up, even to later examination by scholars (Sims *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century* 109; Sims *True Stories* 221-23). A good deal did not, however, including Wolfe's celebrated attack on *The New Yorker* that was itself demolished by two of the magazine's staff writers who documented his factual errors large and small in a lengthy letter published in *Columbia Journalism Review* (Lewin, "Is Fact Necessary?"). Even many supporters of the New Journalism were concerned about whether, for instance, it was ethical for practitioners to combine people into composite characters, as Gail Sheehy did in a multi-part series on prostitution entitled "Redpants and Sugarman" that was published in *New York* magazine in 1971 (Weingarten *From Hipsters to Gonzo* 258-62). The New Journalism was attacked not only by the burghers of American newsrooms but by critics such as Dwight Macdonald, who labelled it "parajournalism" and writes: "It is a bastard form, having it both ways, exploiting the factual authority of journalism and the atmospheric license of fiction." (Weber *The Reporter as Artist* 223). MacDonald's comments were a response to Wolfe's cruelly funny satiric attack on the editor of *The New Yorker*, William Shawn, in 1965 (Wolfe *Hooking Up* 247-93) that alienated a key potential supporter of the New Journalism (Yagoda *About Town* 334-41). What for MacDonald was a problem was for Wolfe the New Journalism's great appeal. Readers felt as involved as if they were reading a novel but also knew "*all this happened*" (Italics in original Wolfe "The New Journalism" 49). But how do they know? That readers had no simple way of knowing the status of what they were reading, and that what some practitioners wrote was closer to fiction than journalism

were two of several factors leading to the decline of the New Journalism in the late 1970s (Weingarten *From Hipsters to Gonzo* 258-62, 275-78).

Wolfe paid little direct attention to the ethics of the New Journalism so it is worth quoting in full what he did write:

If a reporter stays with a person or group long enough, they – reporter and subject – will develop a personal relationship of some sort, even if it is hostility. More often it will be friendship of some sort. For many reporters this presents a more formidable problem than penetrating the particular scene in the first place. They become stricken with a sense of guilt, responsibility, obligation. ‘I hold this man’s reputation, his future, in my hands’ – that becomes the frame of mind. They may begin to feel like voyeurs – ‘I have preyed upon this man’s life, devoured it with my eyes, made no commitment myself, etc.’ People who become overly sensitive on this score should never take up the new style of journalism. They inevitably turn out second-rate work, biased in such banal ways that they embarrass even the subjects they think they are ‘protecting.’ A writer needs at least enough ego to believe that what he is doing as a writer is as important as what anyone he is writing about is doing and that therefore he shouldn’t compromise his own work. If he doesn’t believe that his own writing is one of the most important activities going on in contemporary civilization, then he ought to move on to something else he thinks is...become a welfare eligibility worker or a clean- investment counselor for the Unitarian Church or a noise abatement surveyor (*The New Journalism* 67-68).

It may be, as Wolfe asserts, that journalists can become “overly sensitive” to those they write about, but it is fair to say that in the history of media criticism seldom has such a charge been levelled at journalists. Wolfe’s loaded language – “stricken with guilt,” “voyeurs,” “preyed upon this man’s life” – trivializes a very real issue facing practitioners of book-length journalism. He glibly forecloses the often competing interests of those for whom the journalist writes, and those they write about, in

favour of the former, with barely a thought for the latter beyond his complacent assertion he knows what is best for them.

The term New Journalism faded from popular use, as Wolfe had predicted, but the use of a narrative approach to journalism did not. One effect of the debates it provoked has been work by scholars and practitioners to clarify the nature and boundaries of this area of practice (Sims “The Literary Journalists” 3-25; Connery *Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism* 3-37; Sims and Kramer “Breakable Rules for Literary Journalists” 21-34; Talese and Lounsberry *The Literature of Fact* 29-31). This work uncovered the extent to which practices at even respected magazines like *The New Yorker* had been less rigorous than previously thought. Composite characters were common, as were pages of seemingly seamless quotations in which “untutored Manhattanites spoke at improbable length” (Yagoda *About Town* 401). Some characters in what the magazine called “fact” pieces were invented, which one respected staff writer, Joseph Mitchell, corrected when his work was re-released in 1993 (Mitchell *Up in the Old Hotel* ix; Sims *True Stories* 173-74; Yagoda *About Town* 400-02) Since the mid-1960s John McPhee has written long articles for *The New Yorker* subsequently published in book form, and since 1975 he has taught a course entitled “The Literature of Fact” at Princeton University (Howarth *The John McPhee Reader* xi). He speaks for many current practitioners when he lists the following practices unacceptable: inventing dialogue, creating composite characters out of real people, or getting inside their subject’s head and thinking for them. “Where writers abridge that, they hitchhike on the credibility of writers who don’t” (Sims, *The Literary Journalists* 15-16).

Drawing on the work of these scholars and practitioners as well as the American practitioners interviewed by Boynton in *The New New Journalism* and the Australians interviewed for this thesis, I propose six main elements in book-length journalism as a way of clarifying the nature and range of a field that straddles the print news media and book publishing. It is put forward not to set classifications in concrete but as a means by which to explore this particular area of writing practice and to build on scholarship prompted by the New Journalism. The first, core, element of book-length journalism is that is about actual events and people living in the world, and concerns the issues of the day, though given that a book takes longer to research and write than a newspaper report, journalists try to choose events or people

or issues that merit such an investment of time and energy. Most articles published in newspapers are quickly forgotten because of the sheer number of them, because newspapers are “constantly revisiting the familiar,” as an Australian practitioner, David Marr, puts it (Personal interview), and because news, as Stephens writes, is about “what is on society’s mind” and that changes continually (*A History of News* 4). A former editor of *The Age* newspaper, Graham Perkin, once said that only news reports that have their roots in the past and a stake in the future have any lasting impact (*White Reporting in Australia* 11). This idea applies to book-length journalism. There are books that are produced to deadlines almost as tight as for newspapers and magazines. Known in the publishing industry as “quickies,” these books are produced to capitalize on urgent, widespread public interest, such as the trial of Bradley John Murdoch in 2005 in central Australia for the murder of English backpacker Peter Falconio. One book was published within 48 hours of the announcement of the jury’s decision to find Murdoch guilty (Wilson and Waldren “Books on Falconio Racing into Print”). As speed of publication is the key to a successful “quickie,” it gives away the biggest single advantage a work of book-length journalism has over newspaper and magazine work – time.

The second element of book-length journalism is extensive research. Newspaper journalists are trained or become experienced in gathering information quickly, and at unearthing information that people and institutions may not want revealed. With more time they are able to uncover substantially more information that may itself make news to be reported by the daily media. Woodward, managing editor of *The Washington Post*, is the best known and most consistent exponent of this approach (Shepard Woodward and Bernstein 227-28). Time spent also enables journalists to understand the context in which the subject of the book occurs. Some journalists also engage in “saturation reporting,” to use the term coined by Wolfe in 1970 (Murphy *The New Journalism* 10), where they spend long periods of time observing, interviewing and simply being around those they are writing about in the belief this will yield rich below-the-surface material usually unavailable to journalists bound by daily deadlines. It is relatively common for journalists working on book-length projects to research a topic as intensively as a PhD student, according to Norman Sims, editor of two anthologies of literary journalism and a scholarly book about it (Sims *True Stories* 286-87).

The third element is taking a narrative approach. Narrative studies scholars find narrative in a wide range of writing, but in the field of journalism a distinction is drawn between articles written in an expository or hard news report form and those written to read as if they were a novel, which are described as narrative journalism. It is possible to write a work of book-length journalism in expository form but the majority of them are written predominantly in a narrative mode because the various devices outlined in Wolfe's essay "The New Journalism" enable practitioners to more fully engage their readers. The fourth element of book-length journalism is the range of authorial voices, which is much broader than that allowed daily news reporters who are tethered to the institutional voice of their newspaper. As the sole author of a work of book-length journalism, the journalist can choose their style and tone of voice. Some choose to remain in the background of their books while others foreground their presence. A journalist's choice of voice may differ from book to book, but it is usually driven by their stance on the philosophical question of whether it is possible to represent reality in their work or whether, as Schudson writes, while they believe "The world may be 'out there,' as so many of us commonsensically believe. But no person and no instrument apprehends it directly. We turn nature to culture as we talk and write and narrate it" (*The Power of News* 52).

The fifth element is exploring the underlying meaning of an event or issue. For journalists the aim of spending more time on a project is to explore it in depth, and to report and analyse it from a range of perspectives. They aim to develop an overview of the issue that may include a coherent argument about it, though because journalists seek to attract the broadest possible audience they try to find a balance between making an argument that is intellectually challenging and writing in a narrative mode that engages readers emotionally as well as intellectually. As Australian practitioner Margaret Simons says: "You have more room and space for ambiguity and ambivalence in a book. You don't have to serve it all tied up with a pussy bow. Or, to put it another way, it has to have a theme or why are you writing a book rather than another feature story?" (Personal interview). The sixth and final element of book-length journalism is its impact. As these works focus on events, people and issues that stand out from the daily crush of news coverage, and as more time and energy has been devoted to the research and writing, it is likely to have a greater impact on readers, whether they are the subject of the book or members of the

general public. If the book concerns a topic of public debate, such as, say, terrorism, it may influence policy-makers and others in positions of authority.

Comparing the six elements of book-length journalism with newspaper and magazine journalism illuminates how the three areas of print media operate along a continuum. The subject matter of the three is the same, as are the research methods. Journalists gather material through three main methods: documents (whether in print or online), interviews and first-hand observation. The point of difference comes from the time given to researching a book, which means the journalist will be able to get documents by means such as the Freedom of Information Act whose long lead times make requests (and contesting appeals in court) impractical or off-putting for many but by no means all daily print journalists. (Ricketson, *Freedom of Information and Authors* 26-29). Journalists working on books tend to do more interviews face to face rather than by telephone or email and do longer interviews. They also have more time to observe events and people at first hand than is available to most magazine and, especially, newspaper journalists.

Where the majority of works of book-length journalism are written in a narrative mode, the majority of articles published in newspapers and magazines are in expository form. Hard news reports are in expository form; feature articles can be written in combination of expository and narrative mode. It is common for features to begin with a description of a scene relevant to the article, and equally common for them to revert to exposition for the bulk of the article. When a newspaper journalist is reconstructing a major news event they may choose to present the feature as a chronological narrative. The use of a narrative approach is more common in magazines than newspapers. The average news report runs to five hundred words and few run longer than eight hundred words. Newspaper feature articles begin at around a thousand words and rarely run more than two thousand five hundred words. Magazine features range between two and ten thousand words, occasionally longer (Ricketson *Writing Feature Stories* 4). Newspaper and magazine journalists are yoked to a house style. The conventions of the news report have changed little since it emerged as a journalistic form in the mid-nineteenth century (Mindich *Just the Facts* 64-94) which testifies to its resilience as a vehicle for conveying information quickly and clearly. What distinguishes the work of one journalist's news report from another is less the tone of voice or use of language than the newsworthiness of the

information. By putting information in pride of place, though, news reports exclude or minimize emotion, context and analysis. As Stephens puts it: “When words are herded into any rigid format – from news ballad to two-minute videotape report – their ability to re-create events in their fullness may suffer” (*A History of News* 242). There is some evidence distinctions between various news forms are becoming more fluid (Johnston “Turning the Inverted Pyramid Upside Down”). Those writing features are given some but not much latitude to write in a voice other than that stipulated for hard news reports. It is primarily among columnists that an individual voice is valued, and this applies particularly to personal, as distinct from expert, columnists. An example is Sandra Tsing Loh, whose idiosyncratic columns for *Buzz* magazine in Los Angeles were gathered together in 1996 in the drollly titled *Depth Takes a Holiday*.

Daily journalism puts greater store in astonishing readers than in leading them to understanding (Schudson “News as Stories” 122). Newspaper journalists work under acute deadline pressure, especially in the 21st century when they may also be filing and updating online reports; magazine journalists work under marginally less deadline pressure. Where a newspaper or magazine journalist can be satisfied with making sharp observations, they rarely have time to explore the underlying meanings of an event or issue. A work of book-length journalism needs to be grounded in an overarching argument or a compelling narrative mode or a blend of the two. Finally, newspapers, magazines and books can all have an impact. At the micro level, most newspaper or magazine articles do not have the same impact on a reader as a book. At the macro level, a newspaper can, over a period of time, use its institutional weight to campaign on an issue and make an impact on the body politic in a way that generally is beyond the reach of individual journalists who write books.

In drawing the distinctions between journalism in the three print forms, it can be seen that magazines provide a bridge between the two other forms. They are periodic publications but less driven than newspapers by the news agenda of the day; they provide more space and time than newspapers for journalists who in turn need to develop their skills in narrative in order to keep readers’ attention for the duration of a longer article. In numerous cases, works of book-length journalism have been either reprinted from magazines or have begun life as magazine articles and been expanded to book-length. Well-known examples of the former are Lillian Ross’s

Picture and of the latter, Thompson's *Hell's Angels* (Weingarten *From Hipster to Gonzo* 29, 125-26). Once journalism becomes part of the book publishing industry, however, it is subsumed into non-fiction, a category that unhelpfully is defined by what it is not and which contains a vast range of genres that includes almost everything apart from fiction, drama or poetry.

In bookshops non-fiction may be shelved in a category entitled non-fiction; at the chain store, Borders (in Australia), for instance, new releases are shelved under fiction and non-fiction. More often non-fiction is spread across numerous categories, some of which, like cooking and gardening, do not normally contain works of book-length journalism. Other non-fiction categories, such as politics, philosophy, psychology, true crime, science, the environment, sociology, sport, travel, history and biography, commonly house works of book-length journalism. (Cords *The Real Story* vii-xi). These categories will also contain the work of other authors, perhaps a novelist writing, say, a travel book, a freelance author, or, more often, a specialist in the field, usually an academic. In libraries, non-fiction books are usually catalogued according to their subject matter whereas fiction is catalogued according to author, which decreases the likelihood of readers becoming aware of particular writers of non-fiction. When William Howarth, a literary academic, decided to edit a collection of McPhee's articles he found his work scattered throughout his university's libraries and wondered why. In his assessment McPhee's books had "stretched the artistic dimensions of reportage" and qualified as "Literature" (*The John McPhee Reader* vii-xxiii). In 1999 McPhee won the Pulitzer prize for a general non-fiction book for *Annals of the Former World* (See Appendix D).

Moving from comparing the proposed six elements of book-length journalism with newspaper and magazine journalism to comparing them with various non-fiction genres, the first point is that the subject matter may be the same as it concerns actual events and people, but where the journalist is interested in the issues of the day, an historian is interested in the past. Traditionally, biographies have been about people already dead, but it is relatively common for biographies of living people to be published, and many of these biographers are journalists (Weinberg *Telling the Untold Story*). Academics are trained to study issues dispassionately and in depth, which intersects with the book-length journalist's aim to explore the complexity of an issue but their background also means the majority are less attuned to events and

issues of the day and to making a timely contribution to public debate. Journalistic training usually means that even with more time to work on a book project a journalist is driven by the impulse to write something sooner rather than later, and for a broad rather than specialist audience.

Most authors of non-fiction books do extensive research. There is some overlap with the research methods used by journalists and some points of difference. Almost all researchers draw on documents, some interview those they are writing about and some observe events and people first-hand. Historians are skilled at finding and interpreting primary documents; sociologists are skilled at framing questionnaires and interviewing large numbers of people, and anthropologists are skilled at gaining access to groups of people they want to study and observing them first-hand for long periods of time. Most academic or freelance authors are less experienced than journalists in persuading people who do not want to be interviewed to be interviewed and in persuading them to reveal material that may not be in their best interests. Stephen Oates, an American academic historian, has told how difficult he found it to behave like an investigative journalist while researching a biography of Martin Luther King Jr. “Nothing in graduate school had ever prepared me for this. I was terrible at it. I hated to intrude on other people’s privacy, to ask them to remember things that could be painful.” (Weinberg *Telling the Untold Story 2*).

In trade as distinct from academic publishing it is common for non-fiction books to be written in a narrative mode, to improve the likelihood of engaging the reader and of increasing sales. Novelists who write non-fiction are considered to be well placed because they will already have highly developed writing and narrative skills. Capote is an obvious example, but there are numerous other novelists who have written book-length journalism, including Didion in the United States, Orwell in England, and Garner in Australia. Academic authors are accustomed to write for a specialist rather than a general audience, which is also why the majority of them are less conversant with the wide range of possible narrative voices available to authors of non-fiction. Novelists, by comparison, are used to exploring a number of authorial voices. Academic authors are trained to explore an issue in depth, to analyse it from a range of perspectives and to mount a coherent argument. A novelist writing a non-fiction book may or may not be equipped to mount a coherent argument but will probably be alive to the underlying meanings in an issue or event. Finally, the

novelist's writing ability, and perhaps their reputation, will in all likelihood ensure their non-fiction book makes an impact on readers, though they may be less aware than a journalist of the possibility of their book influencing policy-makers and others in positions of authority. Most academic authors are interested in the broad political and social impact of their work.

Journalism written for newspapers and magazines sits in the context of a well-established practice that is widely known in the community and has attracted a sizeable body of scholarship. The same can be said of the various genres of non-fiction books already listed, especially those such as history, politics and sociology that are also recognized academic disciplines. A journalist may write a book that is described as history or biography or sociology or any of the large number of genres within non-fiction, and be described by their publisher as an historian or biographer or sociologist. Alternatively, the journalist may conceive of, research and write as a journalist and produce a work of book-length journalism. For both projects, the journalist uses the same methods to gather their material, the same writing style and has the same aim of reaching the broadest possible audience. What, then, distinguishes the two? There is no obvious answer. It depends on how the publisher markets the book, where the bookseller displays it, how a librarian categorizes it, how the audience reads it and, finally, whether the author identifies him or herself as a journalist or as a practitioner of a particular non-fiction genre. For example, in Australia, Les Carlyon, a longtime journalist and a former editor of *The Age*, has written two comprehensive historical works, *Gallipoli* in 2001, and *The Great War* in 2006, but is he to be seen as a journalist writing book-length journalism, an historian or a "popular" as distinct from academic historian? In 2007 the latter book was both a co-winner of the Prime Minister's history prize and a finalist in the best non-fiction book award made by the Australian journalists' union, the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance

(http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/key_issues/Australian_History/pm_historyprize.htm; Fletcher and Barraclough "And Then

There Were Ten..." 34-35). Alternatively, a writer normally identified as a novelist, such as Garner, may use the journalistic methods just described to produce a work of book-length journalism, but may well describe her work with another term. Garner called *The First Stone* "reportage" in an author's note but in an interview for this

thesis said she was comfortable with the term book-length journalism (Personal interview).

By the criteria developed in this thesis, Carlyon's books are history and Garner's *The First Stone* is book-length journalism, as Carlyon writes about events that took place more than eighty years beforehand while *The First Stone* concerns contemporary events. Interviewing participants was not available to Carlyon, nor could he observe at first hand the events he was writing about, though he did revisit the battlefields (*The Great War* 8). Book-length journalism concerns contemporary events but the definition allows more flexibility than in daily journalism which predominantly reports what happened the previous day. Similarly, book-length journalism deals mostly with people still alive but incorporates the recently dead; practitioners writing about crime could scarcely survive without that qualification. Biographies of living people can be seen as book-length journalism, if the practitioner uses journalistic research methods and writes in a narrative mode for a broad audience. Such biographers encounter many of the ethical issues discussed in this thesis, as I experienced writing about Australian author Paul Jennings, and have discussed elsewhere ("The Reporting Is All" 46-64). History, biography, sociology and numerous other genres within non-fiction are established among publishers, booksellers, reviewers and readers; book-length journalism is not. The term is not in common use at least partly because it describes an activity that comprises only part of journalism in the print media and only part of non-fiction in publishing.

Books hold a different place in the cultural landscape to newspapers and magazines, which affects the status of the journalist and the expectations readers have of the different media forms. The relationship between journalists and newspapers and magazines is that of employer and employee. The masthead is more important than the individual journalist. The editorial identity of a newspaper or magazine, or, a broadcast media outlet for that matter, is undeniably moulded by individual journalists but it is made up of the sum efforts of many individuals over decades, even centuries. As Al Pacino, playing television producer Lowell Bergman in the 1999 film *The Insider*, comments when contemplating leaving journalism over a thwarted interview with a tobacco company whistleblower: "I'm Lowell Bergman, I'm from *60 Minutes*. You know, you take the *60 Minutes* out of that sentence and nobody returns your phone calls." Newspapers and magazines are, to a greater or

lesser extent, institutions. Readers develop a relationship over time with the institution even though they may grow fond of, or dislike, individual journalists' writings. The relationship between a journalist and a publisher is not one of employer-employee though it is a commercial relationship. The journalist, or journalists in the case of teams such as Woodward and Bernstein, are responsible for the entire content in a book compared to single newspaper or magazine articles. Most readers understand that newspapers and magazines are produced to unyielding deadlines, leading inevitably to at least some errors; they generally expect greater accuracy from a book that has taken at least a year and often more to produce.

If there is not widespread agreement among scholars and practitioners about a preferred term for this activity there is about many of its key texts, some of which are famous. Sims has written that it is easier to cite examples than to define what he calls literary journalism (*Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century* ix). Some practitioners, such as James Agee, are known for a single book while others, such as McPhee, are known for a body of work. The following is a selection of a dozen names and books that are commonly cited in the literature about this field:

James Agee: *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men*

Truman Capote: *In Cold Blood*

Ted Conover: *Newjack: Guarding Sing Sing*

Joan Didion: *Salvador*

John Hersey: *Hiroshima*

John McPhee: *The Pine Barrens*

Norman Mailer: *The Armies of the Night*

George Orwell: *Homage to Catalonia*

Lillian Ross: *Picture*

Gay Talese: *Honor Thy Father*

Hunter S. Thompson: *Hell's Angels*

Tom Wolfe: *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*.

The most recent book in this list was published in 2000 (*Newjack*); the oldest, *Homage to Catalonia*, was published in 1938. Nor is Orwell's the first example of

book-length journalism. Kevin Kerrane and Ben Yagoda compiled an historical anthology of literary journalism in 1997 that included the work of Henry Mayhew, a journalist who co-founded the magazine *Punch* and in 1861-62 published a four-volume survey of London's poor in a style "more literary than sociological" (*The Art of Fact* 34). The anthology's earliest entry was an excerpt from *The True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of the Late Jonathan Wild*, written in 1725 by Daniel Defoe, who "built a writing career in the zone between fiction and fact. His novels, rich in realistic detail, read like documentary reports, while his journalism shines with literary quality" (23) beginning with *The Storm* in 1704, described by another scholar, Jenny McKay, as the first recognizable piece of "book-length features journalism" ("*The Storm* as a Model for Contemporary Reporting" 20). In 1890 Jacob Riis published *How the Other Half Lives*, drawing on his fourteen years as a newspaper police reporter, to write a book-length journalistic account of conditions for poor immigrants in the tenement slums in New York (Good "Jacob A. Riis" 81-89). The novelist Jack London spent seven weeks living in the equivalent slums in the East End of London before writing an impassioned denunciation of celebrations of Edward VII's coronation existing alongside such poverty. Published first in a small socialist magazine, *The People of the Abyss* was soon published as a book in 1903 and sold well (Koenig "Introduction" v-xi).

This list of earlier authors of book-length journalism is by no means exhaustive but the number of such works appears to have increased during the twentieth century and continues into this century. As book-length journalism straddles the print media and non-fiction book publishing, I have sought other ways to map its scope. Sarah Statz Cords, a librarian who in 2006 produced a readers' advisory for non-fiction entitled *The Real Story*, listed one of her eleven categories as "investigative writing" and included in it six of the dozen authors listed above (311-43). Other works, such as *In Cold Blood* and Mailer's *The Executioner's Song*, she catalogued in the true crime section. Steve Weinberg is well placed to assess the development of book-length journalism as he has been reviewing what he calls "investigative books" for three decades and has written two works of book-length journalism himself. He argues "Far more high-quality, in-depth journalism is being disseminated each year than any individual can absorb, and a great deal of that high-quality, in-depth journalism is arriving in book format" and lists seventeen recently published investigative books

about just one topic, albeit a prominent one – the war in Iraq (Weinberg, “The Book as an Investigative Vehicle for News”). His assertion is echoed in an overview of American investigative journalism, which is published in magazines but “more often in the 21st century finds its voice in books” (Aucoin “Journalistic moral engagement” 560) and by the senior vice president of publishing house Farrar, Straus and Giroux (Sifton “The Second Draft of History” 54-57). Jack Shafer, media columnist for the online magazine *Slate*, uses the term “newsbook” for the field of writing that “straddles the space between contemporary history and daily journalism.” For Shafer the core element of newsbooks is their “hard-news edge”. He, too, lists numerous books by journalists about the Iraq war that “break the sort of news that the dailies follow for days and sometimes weeks. And they change the course of the political debate” he writes, citing, among others Michael Isikoff and David Corn’s *Hubris: The Inside Story of Spin, Scandal and the Selling of the Iraq War*, Rajiv Chandrasekaran’s *Imperial Life in the Emerald City* and Thomas Rick’s *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq* (“Newsbooks”).

In Australia the independent media website, www.crikey.com.au counted more than two hundred books produced by Australian journalists in the decade to 2004 (Ricketson “The Awkward Truth” 51). Not all two hundred books meet the criteria set out in this thesis - some were journalists’ memoirs, others were collections of journalists’ articles – but the number still points to a substantial body of work. Michael Webster is principal consultant for Nielsen BookScan, which monitors trade book sales in Australia. He says book-length journalism “is a very popular and credible form of non-fiction. If you sit in on publishers’ meetings when they are discussing potential non-fiction book ideas they will immediately mention the names of respected journalists who write about the particular field or issue” (Personal interview). Webster, who has worked in the publishing industry since 1972, says “It makes sense, really. Journalists are used to writing to deadline. They understand the value of words. They understand target markets and they have a well developed sense of what might be libellous.” Sandy Grant, who has worked in book publishing since 1977 and is chief executive of Hardie Grant Publishing, a small Australian-owned company, says book-length journalism is a “well developed and quite effective part of the publishing industry, especially in the areas of politics, social

comment and business. It is high risk, with the possibilities of litigation, but it is also high reward if you get it right” (Personal interview).

There are other signs the practice is becoming established. Nearly a decade after Applegate’s dictionary was published, Boynton in 2005 published *The New New Journalism*. All nineteen interviewees had written works of book-length journalism, or, what Boynton terms “reportorially based, narrative-driven long form nonfiction” (xi). By comparison, in 1973 when Wolfe and E.W. Johnson assembled their anthology of New Journalism they included pieces by twenty-one journalists, of whom eleven had written book-length journalism at that time. Reasons for the development of this area of writing practice include the consolidation of journalism as a professional practice (Stephens *A History of News* 251), mass literacy (Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses* 3-9) and the particularly vibrant magazine culture in the United States (Tebbel *The Magazine in America* v). A sizeable number of journalists published in *The New Yorker* magazine have written book-length journalism. Of the dozen commonly cited works listed above, for instance, four were originally published as long articles in *The New Yorker*: *Hiroshima*, *Picture*, *In Cold Blood* and *The Pine Barrens* (*The Complete New Yorker* Disks 7, 6, 4, 3). The visibility and fecundity of the New Journalists in the 1960s and 1970s also helped build an audience for journalism published in book form (Weingarten *From Hipsters to Gonzo* 277). In an interview, Boynton emphasized the trend:

The economic structure has changed in such a way that books, not magazines, sustain most of these writers. It used to be that an article in, say, *Esquire* or *The New Yorker* was once the be-all and end-all of a writer’s career (and would be collected, Talese-or-Wolfe-style, into a best-selling book). Today an article in such a publication is more likely to be the inspiration for a best-selling book (as with Jon Krakauer’s *Into Thin Air*), or an excerpt from a book that is about to be published. But books are driving the business side of long-form journalism, not magazines (“A Good Time for Narrative Journalists” 89-91).

What this shift means is that where literary journalism or the New Journalism originated in newspapers and magazines, the continuing development or, to use

Boynton's word, "maturation" (*The New New Journalism* xi) of such work has led to a number of journalists who sometimes write for magazines (and occasionally for newspapers) but whose focus is on book-length projects. The shift is significant because while there may be a long history of journalists writing books it is only in recent years in the United States that it has been possible to consider a relatively well-paid living from producing works of book-length journalism. It has been possible in the past for a writer to build a career that included books but the amount of time needed to research such projects has generally meant these writers needed to develop other, less time-consuming writing projects to subsidize their book-length journalism (Sims "The Literary Journalists" 10-11). Alternatively, as I have argued elsewhere, Australian practitioners made time for their book-length projects by working on them at nights and on weekends or negotiated from their employer special leaves of absence. ("The Reporting Is All" 13-14). If the project stems from their regular work and if the employer stands to benefit from the book through, say, publishing excerpts, they often agree. For instance, Karen Kissane, a journalist with *The Age*, covered a murder trial for the newspaper in 2004 that she later extended to a book entitled *Silent Death* which was excerpted in the newspaper to coincide with its publication ("Profile: Karen Kissane" 1-2). In the United States media columnist Jack Shafer says that prominent metropolitan daily newspapers such as *The Washington Post* grant their staff "book leaves at the drop of a hat" in the knowledge that they will be first to publish what they hope will be fresh news drawn from the journalist's book.

There are, as this suggests, differences as well as similarities between the development of book-length journalism in the United States and Australia. For instance, there are fewer magazines in Australia publishing lengthy articles written in a narrative mode, but that, combined with a gradual shrinking of space for longer features articles in newspapers, is propelling more journalists to write books, according to Shona Martyn, a former magazine editor who is managing director of HarperCollins Publishers in Australia ("A Write of Passage" 20). It is too early to properly assess the implications of the internet as a media and cultural form for book-length journalism. Such an assessment is not central to this thesis, unless it was already clear that book-length journalism would be eradicated by online culture, which it is not. Early indications are, if anything, that the more information is made

widely available, the more people value the skills of a practitioner to sift through the thickets and make some kind of sense of it in an accessible narrative form. In the United States circulation of magazines that are focused on expansive coverage of news and issues, such as *The Economist*, *The Atlantic* and *The New Yorker* has been rising while that of general news magazines such as *Time* and *Newsweek* has been falling, according to the comprehensive annual State of the Media reports published since 2004 by the Project for Excellence in Journalism. In 2006, for instance, *The New Yorker* recorded the highest circulation since its founding in 1925, selling over one million copies weekly

(http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/2008/printable_magazines_chapter.htm).

William Powers, a media commentator for *National Journal*, argues that one of the paradoxes of new media technologies is that the more they enable us to be connected, instantly and to an ever-expanding series of networks, the more people value the experience of being disconnected. That is, of having uninterrupted time and space to themselves. Books and the paper they contain, by definition, are a finite, disconnected medium. “What could be more satisfying than entering a phrase into Google and pulling up exactly the nugget you need? But the immensity of the digital trove also makes it inscrutable, unwieldy and, at times, overwhelming,” (“Hamlet’s Blackberry: Why Paper Is Eternal” 50). What looks like a disadvantage becomes an advantage, Powers argues. “Precisely by being finite, it [paper] imposes order on the vastness of the information universe” (50).

The available evidence suggests that works of book-length journalism appear to have had an impact disproportionate to their number. In Australia and, especially, the United States a body of work has been produced that is significant by a number of measures, including popularity, critical acclaim and impact on public debate. The American trade publication *Publishers Weekly* has produced lists of bestselling fiction since at least the beginning of the twentieth century and of bestselling non-fiction since 1910. To reach the bestseller list in any given week is noteworthy but to be among the top ten bestselling non-fiction books for the year is a considerable achievement, especially given the breadth of non-fiction as a category and the evergreen appeal of books about health, food and self-help. In the past decade works by two of Boynton’s interviewees, Schlosser’s investigation of the takeaway food industry, *Fast Food Nation*, and Cramer’s biography of baseball legend Joe

DiMaggio, both sold well – two hundred thousand plus and one hundred and fifty thousand respectively – but neither reached the annual top ten (Maryles “How They Landed On Top;” Maryles “Few Surprises in the Winners’ Circle”). Few works of book-length journalism reached the annual bestseller list until the second half of the century but between 1960 and 2008 inclusive a total of forty works of book-length journalism have reached the annual top ten. They are listed in Appendix A, beginning with Theodore White’s pioneering political campaign book, *The Making of the President*, taking in Capote’s *In Cold Blood* and Woodward and Bernstein’s *The Final Days*, which was actually the number one selling non-fiction title in 1976, before arriving at Malcolm Gladwell’s *The Tipping Point* in 2000 (<http://www.caderbooks.com/bestintro.html>).

In Australia before the arrival of Nielsen BookScan earlier this decade the Australian Publishers Association published annual bestseller lists but they were not regarded as reliable until the 1990s (Ricketson, *Paul Jennings* 343). That decade saw several works of book-length journalism reach the annual top ten, including Marr’s biography of the Nobel Prize-winning writer, Patrick White, Paul Barry’s biographies of the failed entrepreneur Alan Bond and the successful media mogul Kerry Packer, and Garner’s account of a sexual harassment case, *The First Stone*. Since 2002 Nielsen BookScan has compiled annual bestseller lists separated into fiction and non-fiction but taking in overseas as well as local books. Looking at the top fifty non-fiction books each year, and remembering that the upper reaches of non-fiction bestseller lists are usually dense with cookbooks, travel guides and celebrity memoirs, between 2002 and 2008 inclusive there have been nineteen works of book-length journalism by Australians, including Garner’s *Joe Cinque’s Consolation* (for both 2004 and 2005), Chris Masters’ examination of radio talkback host Alan Jones and Gerald Stone’s *Who Killed Channel 9?* Excluded from this number are several works of popular history by journalists such as Carlyon (*Gallipoli* in 2002, *The Great War* in 2006) and Peter FitzSimons (*Kokoda* in 2004 and 2005, *Tobruk* in 2006). (Appendix E Nielsen BookScan top fifty bestselling non-fiction books).

It would seem to make sense if works of book-length journalism went out of print sooner rather than later as they concern events and issues of the day. Even allowing for the ability of online retailers such as Amazon.com to lengthen the shelf life of

books, a surprising number of works of book-length journalism remain in print, some of them for decades. At the time of writing, all twelve of the books listed earlier in this chapter are still in print. Just why these – and other – works of book-length journalism have remained in print long after their initial topicality has passed prompts questions. First, it may be the event or issue covered in the book is of historic importance, which increases its prospects for enduring interest. For example, the dropping of the first Atomic bomb, at Hiroshima, in 1945, was the subject of Hersey's book. Second, the journalist may have enabled the reader to see a subject in ways not considered or widely known about before, as Conover did by working undercover as a prison guard for a year to write about a difficult, vastly under-reported job for his book *Newjack*. Undercover work certainly raises ethical issues but they are of a kind that could be faced by practitioners of daily as well as book-length journalism and do not need detailed discussion here. I would argue, though, that Conover's practice meets the criteria outlined by the SPJ's ethics handbook (Black, Steele and Barney 163). The public interest value of Conover's disclosures was genuinely significant; he had also tried and failed to gain open access to prisons, which he documents early in the book (17-22). He minimized the impact of his deception by giving pseudonyms to many of the guards (Author's note) and by writing only about the guards' work, not their private lives. In an afterword to the paperback edition he explains his decision-making in detail (311-19); he also set up a website (www.tedconover.com) where he welcomed feedback from prison guards about the book. Fakazis concludes: "Ultimately, Conover used deception and journalism's codified ethical guidelines to write a story that is true to the experience of prison guards" ("How Close Is Too Close?" 56-57). Third, the journalist may have written about an otherwise unexceptional subject in an enduringly memorable way, as McPhee did in *Oranges* by ingeniously peeling the subject of an everyday fruit, opening it up segment by segment. In all likelihood, many works of book-length journalism, like the majority of novels published, are forgotten in a year or two; that is still far longer than the memory-span of most of the thousands of news reports published each year.

It would be naïve to believe the awarding of prizes was not inflected by politics, not to mention petty jealousies, but awards are at least one marker of what is assessed by judging panels to be outstanding work. In Australia, the recent setting up of two

awards points to a recognition of book-length journalism. When the Queensland Premier, Peter Beattie, following other Australian states, set up his literary awards in 1999 he included a new type of award, for “advancing public debate.” In five of the ten years to 2008 the award has been won by journalists who have produced book-length journalism, including Marr and Marian Wilkinson’s *Dark Victory*, Haigh’s *Asbestos House* and Masters’ *Jonestown*. The award winners are listed in Appendix F. In 2005 the Walkley Foundation, which administers the Walkley awards on behalf of the MEAA, noted “a major growth in the demand for non-fiction that had coincided with an increasing number of titles that bore the names of Australia’s journalists. While the market had increased its demand, there were no major literary awards that specifically recognized journalism in book form,” according to Mary Cotter of the foundation (Email interview). The Walkleys are the most prestigious journalism awards in Australia. In its first year the new award attracted sixty-three entries, as many as all but a few of the other award categories, and in 2007 the number of entries rose to seventy-five. Garner’s *Joe Cinque’s Consolation* was highly commended in 2005 while Bob Connolly’s account of how he and his wife Robin made three documentaries about life in Papua New Guinea, entitled *Black Harvest*, was the inaugural winner. Neil Chenoweth’s account of financial chicanery in Sydney, *Packer’s Lunch*, won in 2006, Masters’ *Jonestown* won in 2007 and in 2008 the award was won by Don Watson for *American Journeys*.

Where the Walkley award is explicitly tied to book-length journalism, the Pulitzer prize for general non-fiction is open to all writers of non-fiction; this has the effect of disguising how often it has been won by a journalist. The Pulitzers were established in the will of the prominent newspaper editor and proprietor, Joseph Pulitzer, early in the twentieth century and offer fourteen awards for journalism but they also offer awards for fiction, drama, poetry, history, biography/autobiography and music. The general non-fiction award is “for a distinguished and well documented book of nonfiction by an American author that is not eligible for consideration in any other category;” it was first awarded in 1962 (<http://www.pulitzer.org/citation/2008-General-Nonfiction>). In its early years the award went mostly to academic writers but in the twenty-seven years since 1982 the majority of winners have been for works of book-length journalism – fifteen in all. Listed at Appendix D, the winners include Tracy Kidder’s *The Soul of a New Machine*, J. Anthony Lukas’ *Common Ground: A*

Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families, McPhee's *Annals of the Former World* and, in 2007, Wright's *The Looming Tower*.

The development of journalism in general and of book-length journalism in particular has prompted scholars and practitioners to create a canon, which raises questions of cultural politics. It was the English poet W.H. Auden who wrote almost half a century ago: "Some books are undeservedly forgotten; none are undeservedly remembered" (Auden "Reading" 10). It still seems an incisive insight, and one applicable to book-length journalism even though Auden was discussing fiction and poetry. Considerable scholarship has since been devoted to how literary reputations are forged and how canons are not pre-ordained but contested and shaped by politics, culture, ethnicity, gender and class. John Rodden's *The Politics of Literary Reputation: the Making and Claiming of "Saint George" Orwell*, published in 1989, is one example, and concerns an author who wrote book-length journalism as well as fiction. The practice of journalism, including at book-length, illustrates the politics of the construction of canons in that such work has been largely excluded from the western literary canon (Hartsock *A History of American Literary Journalism* 206-07; Campbell *Journalism, Literature and Modernity* 1-8). The purpose of this thesis is not to install book-length journalism in the western literary canon. Rather, I am persuaded by Milner's argument in *Literature, Culture and Society* that the collapsing of notions of "high" and "popular" literature does not mean that all writing carries the same value but that scholars should be clearer in their own minds about the assumptions underlying their criticism so that they can articulate more precisely what qualities in a piece of writing they value and why.

The approaching new millennium offered a concrete opportunity to begin making a canon for journalism. In 1999 the New York University Journalism Department organized a panel of judges to draw up a list of the "Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century." Work was chosen from print and broadcast but not online media, which was then in its infancy. Book-length journalism was included too (<http://www.infoplease.com/ipea/A0777379.html>). What is most interesting for this thesis is that of the list of one hundred entries, thirty-eight, or more than a third, were books. Of these, twenty-three were created as book-length works and fifteen were long magazine articles published as books or magazines articles or newspaper series extended to book length. These fifteen do not include newspaper or magazine articles

gathered together and published as a book. It is not well remembered, for instance, that Mailer's "The Steps of the Pentagon," which forms the first, long part of *The Armies of the Night*, was originally published as a magazine article, albeit at ninety thousand words a remarkably long one (Weingarten 183-87). Number one on the university's list was Hersey's *Hiroshima*, whose thirty-one thousand words occupied an entire issue of *The New Yorker* when it was first published in 1946 before being published as a book (Yagoda 183-93). The creation of the American list prompted me to produce a similar one in Australia. At that time I was head of the Journalism program at RMIT University in Melbourne. A panel of judges from industry and the academy compiled a list of one hundred entries but chose not to rank them. Fourteen of the entries were for book-length journalism (<http://fifth.estate.rmit.edu.au/Febo4/best100/00.html>). The paucity of Australian magazines willing and able to publish the kind of lengthy articles common in *The New Yorker* and *Harpers* means the list does not include any magazine articles later published in book form. The strong representation of book-length journalism on both these lists may stem in part at least from the state of research in the relatively young discipline of journalism studies where it was easier for judging panels to turn first to journalism published in book form rather than engage in the prodigiously time-consuming process of reading through a century of newspapers and magazines. Journalism that was deemed publishable in book form is an initial culling process, however. The works of book-length journalism included in the American and Australian lists is at Appendix C.

What the mapping of this area of journalistic practice shows is that it is more extensive than has been generally recognized, and that when successfully executed, it is popular or critically acclaimed or both. What I propose is of value in book-length journalism derives from its constituent elements outlined earlier. To be specific: the immediacy and urgency of the journalist's probing of events, issues and people that affect society; the fresh information and insights yielded by in-depth research that may influence public debate; the opportunity for the reader to be shown something about the world and its people that they know little about; the level of engagement for the reader offered by a book written in a narrative mode, and the pleasure for the reader if the journalist writes in a distinctive or memorable style. Of the many works of book-length journalism available, many exemplify some or all of the qualities

listed above. To provide some examples, Barbara Ehrenreich, in *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By In America*, had the idea in 1998 of testing American president Bill Clinton's belief that people could survive earning US\$7 an hour. She took a succession of low-paid jobs in diners, at Wal-Mart and as a house cleaner, which showed a fierce commitment to investigating policy arguments about poverty through on-the-ground reporting that echoed Orwell's project half a century earlier in *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Published in 2001, her book was studded with footnotes as might be expected from a longstanding social critic and author, but her approach to the subject on this occasion was determinedly journalistic, yielding a book that was by turns gritty, personal, informative, trenchant and penetrating. She found that many people earning low wages needed to take a second job just to pay basic bills, which added further stress to their lives and those of their families. She concluded that affluent people such as herself should not so much feel guilt about the level of poverty but shame: "Shame at our *own* dependency, in this case, on the underpaid labor of others" (221).

Book-length journalism that yields newsworthy information, such as Woodward's books routinely do, clearly carries the value that accrues to news, but it is higher grade ore as it owes its existence to the journalist's ability to unearth it as distinct from the simpler and more common journalistic activity of reporting an event that has happened or a media conference or release of an official report. It is also important to note that the act of drawing a newsworthy item from a full-length book can be fraught, as it (necessarily) reduces the material to the form of the daily news report. Masters' *Jonestown*, for instance, which the Walkley award judges said balanced a "rigorous study of the role and pervasive influence of radio talkback on government and policy makers – and the potential for media corruption – with a richly detailed and human picture" (*The Walkley magazine* "2007 Walkley Awards for Excellence in Journalism" 63) was reduced to a news report, and ensuing controversy, about Jones' sexuality (Pearson "Detestable Standards;" Flint "Psychosexual treatment of Alan Jones relies on rumours"). The gap here between the practice of daily and book-length journalism highlights one of the values of the latter: setting newsworthy events in their context. One of Hersey's several achievements in *Hiroshima* was to be able to provide more accurate number of dead (one hundred thousand) and injured (as many again) than the United States

government had released and to confirm the cause of death of many victims – radiation sickness (Lifton and Mitchell *Hiroshima in America* 53-55, 88; Yagoda *About Town* 192). Wilfred Burchett, an Australian, was the first western journalist to assert this, describing what he saw as “the atomic plague” in his exclusive report for *The Daily Express* in London in September 1945 but the deputy head of the Manhattan project, Brigadier-General Thomas Farrell, had strongly denied Burchett’s report at a press conference and accused him of falling victim to Japanese propaganda (Burchett *Memoirs of a Rebel Journalist* 229-46, Heenan *From Traveller to Traitor* 69-74). When Hersey’s *Hiroshima* was printed in book form by Penguin in November 1946, it was banned in Japan for two years by the American Occupational Authority under the command of General Douglas MacArthur (Sanders *John Hersey Revisited* 19-20)

Newsworthy disclosures in works of book-length journalism can make a substantial impact, which mirrors the kind of impact that is the aim of investigative journalism, and which sits within the news media’s role as a watchdog on institutions and people in positions of power in society. An early, famous example is Ida Tarbell’s two-volume book entitled *A History of the Standard Oil Company* that was published in 1904 just after it had run in nineteen monthly parts in *McClure’s* magazine. Her articles and book painstakingly documented the extent to which the company, co-founded by John D. Rockefeller Sr., had monopolized the oil industry through both enterprising business skills and ruthless, even illegal, activities. Tarbell’s work cut through the secrecy surrounding Standard Oil and laid bare its convoluted structure in clear language that prodded readers to outrage and made Rockefeller one of the most hated figures in the country, according to his biographer, Ron Chernow (*Titan* 425-65). The then US president, Theodore Roosevelt, had been working to break up the anti-competitive behaviour of trusts in American business and Tarbell’s work not only exposed Standard Oil but built a broad base of support for action. In 1906 his government filed an anti-trust suit against Standard Oil that led to a Supreme Court order to dissolve the company. In a dual biography of Rockefeller and Tarbell, Weinberg argues Tarbell’s eight hundred page book is perhaps “the greatest work of investigative journalism ever written” (*Taking on the Trust* ix) while another Rockefeller biographer, David Freeman Hawke, writes that it was one of very few books to change the course of history (Weinberg xii).

Where the work of Tarbell underlines the value to society of book-length journalism, it is more common for works to contain information that in all likelihood will be new to readers but not necessarily newsworthy; that is, the information fulfils a common newsroom definition of news, namely, “tell me something I don’t know,” but either does not have the hard edge necessary for a newspaper report or is not reducible to the inverted pyramid formula. The ability of journalists to unearth sizeable amounts of relevant, interesting information is easily overlooked in book-length journalism where information is presented without a tag signalling its newness as is implicit in a daily newspaper report. Most works of book-length journalism contain much information new to readers unless they are already specialists in the field. Some of the new information stems from the journalist’s witnessing of events that the reader probably will not have seen for themselves, especially if the event took place overseas or is outside the reader’s range of experience. In *Stasiland* Anna Funder reveals what life has been like for ordinary East Germans after the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989. East Germany had been a closed society ruled by its secret police, the Stasi. She reports, for instance, that where in Hitler’s Third Reich it was estimated there was one Gestapo agent for every two thousand citizens and in Stalin’s Soviet Union a KGB agent for every 5830 people, in East Germany there was one Stasi officer or informant for every sixty-three people (*Stasiland* 57). Surveillance was not only widespread, but creepily invasive, she writes, as the Stasi had developed a “quasi-scientific” method of “smell sampling” in the belief that surreptitiously taking samples of citizens’ clothes, often their underwear, would help them find criminals (8).

Many readers value works of book-length journalism that help them make sense of newsworthy events. When Woodward and Bernstein published *All the President’s Men*, among the hundreds of letters they received from readers were scores thanking them for explaining what had been a confusing, hotly contested issue that played out incrementally over months (Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 95). More visibly, readers value book-length journalism that leads them to parts of the world of which they have little experience or knowledge. In 1966 Hunter S. Thompson drove readers into a sub-culture on the fringe of American society by writing about a notorious motorcycle gang for his book *Hell’s Angels*. Before that Thompson had written a magazine article for *The Nation* that was limited to a critique of the mainstream news

media's alarmist and ill-informed coverage of the gang's activities. The article is sharp but contains little of the material he gathered while riding with the gang on and off for about a year (McKeen *Outlaw Journalist* 96-112). Bill Buford, when editing the English literary magazine *Granta*, reprised and extended Thompson by running with groups of soccer fans, in *Among the Thugs*. In a less determinedly macho vein, John Lahr, theatre critic for *The New Yorker*, takes readers backstage for a season at the Royal Drury Lane in London of one of Barry Humphries's shows, in *Dame Edna Everage and the Rise of Western Civilisation*, offering a rare insight into the life of a performer and his relationship with his audience.

Turning from the quality of the information disclosed to the style of the prose, it is clear that book-length journalism written in an urgent narrative mode appeals to many readers. Certain events, such as disasters, rescues and crime, lend themselves particularly well to such journalism. Examples include *Alive*, in which Piers Paul Read, a successful novelist, reconstructed the ten week struggle for survival by people stranded after a plane crash in the Andes mountains in 1972. The survivors had to make an agonizing decision over whether to eat those who had already died. Krakauer's account of an ill-starred climbing expedition to Mount Everest in 1996 that saw eight climbers die, entitled *Into Thin Air*, is equally gripping. Read's book was adapted for film and was included in Kerrane and Yagoda's historical anthology of literary journalism: "What finally makes *Alive* such an extraordinary document is that Read, in his calmly straightforward yet riveting prose, does what the great works of literature have always done. He provides a singular look at the workings of the human spirit, and an illuminated path to the great questions – in this case, what does it mean to be alive?" (*The Art of Fact* 183). Krakauer's book was a finalist for both the Pulitzer prize for general non-fiction and the National Book Critics Circle award (Boynton *The New New Journalism* 156). With such dramatic events, the temptation for the journalist is to focus on recounting what happened, and to strip out any complications, such as conflicting versions of events and avoid analysing any issues prompted by the event. That does not occur in *Alive* or *Into Thin Air* but book-length journalism about crime appears particularly susceptible to this last problem. Usually called true crime, it is one of the most popular non-fiction genres (Cords *The Real Story* 60); many works focus exclusively, even pruriently, on details of the crime and the criminal rather than use the space provided in a book to attempt to understand the

crime or set it in a broader social context. This charge has been made about the bestselling book by John Silvester and Andrew Rule, *Underbelly: The Gangland War* (included in Appendix E), that Rule defends on the ground that “Unvarnished evil is banal – too boring and too ghastly to be entertaining” (“The Truth behind *Underbelly*”). Such a defence comes close to saying that the purpose of writing a book about a war between rival drug traffickers that saw up to twenty-nine people murdered and deep fears expressed about police corruption, is to entertain.

Book-length journalism that focuses narrowly on a dramatic event is what Nicholas Lemann, dean of the Columbia School of Journalism, calls “yarn-spinning.” To him, “the marriage of narrative and analysis is the fundamental project of journalism” (“Weaving Story and Idea” 112-16). Lemann’s book-length journalism testifies to his belief: both *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration And How It Changed America*, published in 1991, and *The Big Test: The Secret History Of American Meritocracy*, published eight years later, blend an idea with how that idea is driven by policy-makers and how it is experienced by ordinary people. The first book concerns the migration of African-American from the south after the introduction of cotton-picking machines rendered their labour redundant and how – and why – the cities that received them, such as Chicago, struggled, and failed, in their “war on poverty” in black communities. The latter book examines how soon after the end of the Second World War, educational bureaucrats set up the Educational Testing Service, creator of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), with the aim of creating a pure meritocracy that would wash through the entire democracy; the test soon become all pervasive and with that came a rash of unintended consequences. Short summaries do not capture the nuance of the arguments Lemann develops in both books; nor do they convey how difficult it is for a practitioner to make engaging reading out of such abstract material as the spread of an educational testing system. As Lemann writes, however: “Purely analytic work or purely narrative work is conceptually cleaner than the blending of the two. Narrative married to idea is complicated, difficult, and somewhat messy. So what? Life is, too. If it weren’t, there wouldn’t be any need for journalism” (“Weaving Story and Idea” 116). Another prominent example of such work is Rosenbaum’s *Explaining Hitler: The Search For The Origins Of His Evil*, which combines his obsessive quest to understand the Nazi leader with his accounts of meetings with historians and filmmakers in a book that is

not only thoroughly readable and stimulating but as one reviewer writes: “its personal, freewheeling qualities enable Rosenbaum to get closer to the demonic element in Hitler than he would have done if he had been a professional historian” (Boynton *The New New Journalism* 327).

Relatively few journalists are read primarily for their prose style, but those who are have become some of the best known practitioners. The most obvious example is Wolfe. His idiosyncratic and attention-grabbing use of punctuation was the first thing many readers and critics noticed followed soon after by other elements of his narrative voice, which even in a piece of cultural criticism, was loud and sassy. In “The New Journalism,” Wolfe writes that from early in his career he would do anything to avoid “coming on like the usual non-fiction narrator, with a hush in my voice, like a radio announcer at a tennis match” (31). To Wolfe, this understated voice was the great problem of non-fiction writing:

You can’t imagine what a positive word ‘understatement’ was among both journalists and literati ten years ago. There is something to be said for the notion, of course, but the trouble was that by the early 1960s understatement had become an absolute pall. Readers were bored to tears without understanding why. When they came upon that pale beige tone, it began to signal to them, unconsciously, that a well-known bore was here again, ‘the journalist,’ a pedestrian mind, a phlegmatic spirit, a faded personality, and there was no way to get rid of the pallid little troll, short of ceasing to read (31).

Few people stopped reading Wolfe, then or since. Thompson’s *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas* is an extreme example. Not many readers remember the actual assignment Thompson was supposed to be covering, but most remember the book’s opening lines:

We were somewhere around Bartsow on the edge of the desert when the drugs began to take hold. I remember saying something like ‘I feel a bit lightheaded; maybe you should drive...’ And suddenly there was a terrible roar all around us and the sky was full of what looked like huge bats, all swooping and screeching and diving around the car,

which was going about a hundred miles an hour with the top down to Las Vegas. And a voice was screaming: 'Holy Jesus! What are those goddamn animals?'

For the record, it was *Rolling Stone* magazine that sent Thompson out to Las Vegas to cover a motorcycle race and a district attorneys' convention about drugs. Whether *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas* is journalism is not quite the point here; Thompson's idiosyncratic style, equal parts apocalyptic self-dramatizing, vivid description and razor-sharp insights, is found, too, in his more obviously journalistic work, such as *Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72*. If Thompson and Wolfe's narrative voices draw attention to their individuality, others are less showy but equally distinct, such as that of Didion, Orwell in England and, in Australia, Garner, all of whom draw readers for their authorial voice as well as for what they have to say about a subject.

What emerges from this analysis is that the value of book-length journalism derives as much from the material disclosed as how it is written. Where in daily journalism more value is set on the information disclosed than how it is presented, and in novels more value sits in the quality of the prose and the story told than in the information content, book-length journalism sits in the middle of the continuum between daily journalism and novels. Along this continuum, of course, the claim on our attention of some works of book-length journalism is made more by the material disclosed than the prose style, and vice versa, just as some daily journalism is arrestingly written and some novels dense with well-researched information. The examples given already and works listed in the appendices demonstrate that what is being offered in book-length journalism is: fresh information, more information, information set in context and information whose meaning has been mined and shaped into a narrative that fully engages readers' minds and emotions. Value deriving from information disclosed sits within well-established claims about the free flow of information in a democratic society; by that criterion alone, book-length journalism carries weight. Housing all this information in a well-constructed narrative mode magnifies the work's potential impact on readers; it could also magnify potential ethical issues. To examine that possibility, it is necessary to move from describing and discussing the nature and range of book-length journalism to exploring and assessing the experience and practice of book-length journalism that has been produced in Australia.

CHAPTER THREE: AUSTRALIAN PRACTITIONERS' EXPERIENCE OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM

We are all haiku writers in newspapers but in a book you have a different relationship with the reader, and you have to use different language. I think a useful image is the maze. You are saying to the reader, 'Stick with me, we'll get to some tricky spots and some dead-ends and we'll even, I'm afraid to warn you, get to some boring bits but the journey will be worth it and I'll get you to the other end.'

David Marr (Personal interview 2007).

In the previous two chapters I argued that the concentration in the academic and professional literature on discussing works in this area of journalism practice deemed to be literary or artistic has the effect of obscuring three key issues: first, whether there are particular ethical issues arising in book-length journalism, second the extent to which journalism is practiced at book-length as well as in newspapers and magazines, and third whether the ethical issues inherent in representing people, events and issues in a narrative mode of writing are magnified or diminished by the practitioner's literary or artistic skills, or whether they are triggered by the taking of a narrative approach. Further, I outlined the nature and range and value of book-length journalism, and showed how a significant proportion of works published are gaining success either commercially, critically, in influencing public debate, or by all three measures. The act of re-orienting the critical debate about this area of journalism practice stems from my engagement with the American rather than the Australian scholarly and professional literature as the latter is considerably less developed than the former.

In Australia, the practice of book-length journalism is more advanced than the scholarship surrounding it. To chart the range of Australian work produced in this area of practice, I have drawn on the model provided by Sims (*Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century* 281-89; *True Stories* 359-74) to compile for this thesis a list of notable Australian works of book-length journalism. (See Appendix G). The criteria for inclusion is similar to that outlined in the previous chapter: the work was successful commercially, critically, won awards or a mention in the Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century, it was innovative or was recommended to me by colleagues in journalism and publishing. Acknowledging the ultimately subjective nature of such lists, a small number of works are included mainly because I feel they should be. The earliest publication mirrors that of the American practitioners mentioned in the previous chapter. In 1895 George Morrison's *An Australian in China: Being the Narrative of a Quiet Journey across China to Burma*, was published, recounting Morrison's astonishing trip by foot dressed as a local but speaking no Chinese. Whether *An Australia in China* should be classified as travel or book-length journalism is open to debate, but Morrison worked as a journalist both before and after he wrote the book and it is brimful with vivid eyewitness descriptions (Pearl Morrison of *Peking* 19-24, 67-77). The list of notable works numbers nearly one hundred, representing a substantial body of practice across a range of topics, including politics (Pamela Williams' *The Victory*), business (Trevor Sykes' *The Bold Riders*), art (Robert Hughes' *The Art of Australia*), society (Donald Horne's *The Lucky Country*), sport (Harry Gordon's *The Time of our Lives*), media (Paul Barry's *The Rise and Rise of Kerry Packer*), the law (Mark Aarons' *War Criminals Welcome*), religion (Geraldine Brooks' *Nine Parts of Desire*), crime (Karen Kissane's *Silent Death*), indigenous Australia (Chloe Hooper's *The Tall Man*), natural disaster (Kimina Lyall's *Out of the Blue*), terrorism (Sally Neighbour's *In the Shadow of Swords*), industrial relations (Helen Trinca and Anne Davies' *Waterfront*), war (Osmar White's *Green Armour*), espionage (Phillip Knightley's *Philby*) and immigration (Peter Mares' *Borderline*).

Scholarly and professional attention in Australia to literary journalism and narrative journalism – if not specifically to book-length journalism – is emerging (Ricketson "True Stories" 149-65; Eisenhuth and McDonald *The Writer's Reader* 38-42 70-75; O'Donnell "Special Issue: Narrative and Literary Journalism" 1-154). None of the

Australian practitioners discussed in this chapter, however, has received detailed scholarly attention for their journalism practice, though I have discussed Garner's *The First Stone* ("Helen Garner's *The First Stone*" 79-100) and her book has been analysed from a range of perspectives, including feminism and literature (Goldsworthy *Helen Garner* 64-90) and as a media event (Taylor "Stones, Ripples, Waves"). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to analyse further the historical development of book-length journalism in Australia, though it is an important topic needing further research. I chose instead to investigate current practice and began by devising a detailed questionnaire (see Appendix B) for semi-structured face to face interviews conducted in 2006 and 2007 with: Bryson, Garner, Knox, Marr and Simons. Each interview took between ninety minutes and two hours, and each required at least one, shorter follow-up interview by telephone. The work of another practitioner, Estelle Blackburn, is examined but she was not interviewed as she has written a detailed account of how she produced a work of book-length journalism, *End of Innocence*. The practitioners were chosen for several reasons: because they have produced landmark works or controversial works, because they have written both journalism and novels, because they have spent time reflecting on journalistic practice or for a combination of these reasons. In mid-2008 Chloe Hooper's work of book-length journalism, *The Tall Man*, about the death in custody of an Aboriginal man, Cameron Doomadgee, was published and was short-listed for the MEAA's Walkley award for best non-fiction book award. I interviewed her in early 2009 and found her reflections candid and insightful but they did not add substantial new material to the earlier interviews. Accordingly, I have opted not to discuss her work in detail, though I have drawn on her comments on some issues. A brief outline of the practitioners' backgrounds follows. Unless otherwise indicated, the biographical information comes from the interviewees.

Estelle Blackburn: Blackburn has worked in newspapers, radio and television journalism, primarily in Western Australia, as well working for eight years as a press secretary for two Police Ministers and a Premier. She gave up full-time work for six years to research and write *Broken Lives*, which in 2001 won a Walkley award for the most outstanding contribution to journalism

(<http://www.walkleys.com/winners/database.html>) and in the same year won the Crime Writers Association of Australia's Ned Kelly award for best true crime book.

Her book prompted the re-opening and eventual quashing of convictions for murder for two men, and Blackburn continues to campaign for other people she believes have been wrongfully convicted of crimes (Biographical note at the front of *End of Innocence*). Blackburn is best known for producing a significant work of book-length journalism.

John Bryson: Bryson worked as a criminal lawyer before coming to journalism. He has written freelance journalism for various publications, which was gathered together in 1988 in *Backstage at the Revolution*. In 1985 his re-investigation and reconstruction of the Azaria Chamberlain murder case was published under the title *Evil Angels*, and was later adapted for film. It won five awards, including the Victorian Premier's prize for non-fiction and, in the United Kingdom, the Crime Writers' Association golden dagger. It has been translated into ten languages and was included in the Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century. He has also written a number of short stories, collected in a volume entitled *Whoring Around*, and a novel entitled *To the Death, Amic*. Bryson, too, is best known for producing a single, landmark work of book-length journalism.

Helen Garner: Garner began writing as a freelance journalist, for the alternative magazine *Digger*, in the early 1970s. Her first novel, *Monkey Grip*, was published in 1977. It was followed by four others that established her reputation as one of Australia's leading writers of fiction (Goldsworthy *Helen Garner*). Since then, she has established a second reputation, for her book-length journalism, in *The First Stone* and *Joe Cinque's Consolation*. Her feature articles were included in the Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century. Selections of Garner's freelance journalism were published in *The Feel of Steel* and *True Stories*, which included a feature article about child abuse that won a Walkley award, in 1993 (<http://www.walkleys.com/winners/database.html>). In March 2008 Garner published her first novel in 16 years, *The Spare Room*, though interviewers and reviewers questioned whether it was non-fiction in disguise (Legge "Truly Helen;" Steger "It's Fiction and that's a Fact;" "Briefly Noted" *The New Yorker*). Garner, like Capote, came to book-length journalism from a background as a novelist.

Malcolm Knox: Knox has worked as a journalist for *The Sydney Morning Herald* since 1994. He has written three works of book-length journalism: *Taylor and*

Beyond, Secrets of the Jury Room and *Scattered: The Inside Story of Ice in Australia*. He has also written three novels: *Summerland*, *A Private Man* and *Jamaica*. He has written essays for publications such as *The Monthly* and *Overland*. He has won Walkley awards for magazine feature writing, in 2007, and for investigative journalism, in 2004, for a series of articles he wrote, some with Caroline Overington, exposing Norma Khouri's memoir *Forbidden Love* as a hoax (<http://www.walkleys.com/winners/database.html>). Knox has worked in daily print journalism for around fifteen years but had been writing (unpublished) novels before that. He continues to straddle both worlds successfully, which is rare in Australia.

David Marr: Marr has worked as a journalist for the past three decades, on staff at *The Bulletin*, *The National Times*, *The Sydney Morning Herald* and at the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) for programs including *Four Corners*, *Arts Today* and *Media Watch*. He has won three Walkley awards (<http://www.walkleys.com/winners/database.html>) and his work was included in the Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century. He has written six works of book-length journalism: *The Ivanov Trail*, *Dark Victory* (with Marian Wilkinson), *The High Price of Heaven*, *The Henson Case*, *Barwick* and *Patrick White: A Life*. The last two of these are biographies of (then) living people, one a High Court judge, Sir Garfield Barwick, the other Australia's Nobel Prize-winning author. Marr is both one of Australia's leading journalists and an articulate critic of the news media. *Dark Victory* is a landmark work of book-length journalism, which in 2003 won the Queensland Premier's literary award for advancing public debate.

Margaret Simons: Simons has worked as a journalist since 1982, on staff at newspapers including *The Age* and *The Australian* and as a freelance journalist for a range of publications, and for the online news website, *Crikey.com.au*. She has written three works of book-length journalism: *Fit to Print*, *The Meeting of the Waters*, which won the Queensland Premier's non-fiction book prize, and *The Content Makers*. She has written two novels: *The Ruthless Garden*, which won the Angus & Robertson Bookworld prize, and *The Truth Teller*. She did a PhD by project at the University of Technology in Sydney; *The Meeting of the Waters* was the project and she also wrote an exegesis reflecting on the issues raised in researching and writing the book. She has taught journalism at several Australian

universities. Simons has written significant works of book-length journalism and has studied and written extensively about the news media.

I will deal with the practitioners' works in chronological order, as that offers to at least sketch how recent practice has developed in Australia. The first to be considered is Bryson, whose book *Evil Angels* was one of seven written about the Azaria Chamberlain case, but it is the only one still in print, having sold at least 186,205 copies (Personal interview); few remember any of the other books (Ricketson "Where's the Writer?"). After the death of baby Azaria Chamberlain in the central Australian desert in 1980, a coronial inquest found that a dingo had taken the baby but after Northern Territory police gathered more evidence a second inquest committed Azaria's parents to stand trial for her murder (Berry "Case That Split a Nation"). In 1982 a jury returned a guilty verdict against Lindy Chamberlain and against her husband Michael for being an accessory after the fact; she was sentenced to life imprisonment. Within weeks of the verdict two books were released: *Azaria* by Richard Shears and *Azaria: Wednesday's Child* by James Simmonds. The Chamberlains appealed the conviction unsuccessfully. The case generated enormous and continuing public interest, especially in the Chamberlains' Seventh Day Adventist faith and Lindy's pregnancy during the trial. Originally, Bryson had been impelled to write about the Chamberlain case because he was angered and disgusted at how the police mishandled the investigation, how they treated the Chamberlains and how they leaked inflammatory material to the news media. Bryson had not attended the first coronial inquest but attended the second inquest, the trial and the subsequent appeals (Personal interview). Drawing on his training as a criminal lawyer, Bryson critically examined the evidence, especially as presented by forensic experts, and reached a different conclusion to the jury. Bryson believed the evidence presented did not prove guilt beyond reasonable doubt; to the contrary, he found it deeply flawed.

Public opinion on the case had been sharply divided with a majority opposed to Lindy Chamberlain; Bryson's book was the first to seriously question the evidence and it began influencing public opinion but equally important was the discovery in February 1986 of a vital piece of missing evidence that supported Lindy Chamberlain's long held belief that a dingo had stolen her baby. Baby Azaria's missing matinee jacket was found by chance as it lay near the body of a British

backpacker who had died in an accident at Uluru (Bryson “Afterword”). Days later the Northern Territory government set her free and announced a Royal Commission, which in 1987 found the evidence presented in the original trial insufficient to justify the guilty verdicts. Adrian Howe, author of a detailed retrospective of the case, describes *Evil Angels* as “the most influential miscarriage-of-justice book ever written in Australia” (*Lindy Chamberlain Revisited* 110).

The books by Shears and Simmonds retrace events chronologically, from the Chamberlains’ holiday at the Alice Springs camping ground through to the trial, with little overt commentary and little analysis of the case for or against them. Shears’ view of the case is opaque, and while Simmonds does say very near the end of his book that he believed the Chamberlains were innocent, his comment is confined to one sentence and hedged by his wariness about the unpredictability of juries (209). These books, then, are “quickies” telling the reader little more than they read in the daily media coverage. More significantly, Steve Brien, a journalist with *The Sun* in Sydney, befriended the Chamberlains during the coronial inquests but revealed in his book, published in 1984, that “Ever since I had known the full ramifications of the police case I had always believed Lindy was guilty” (369). He suggested two “scenarios” for what happened at Uluru in 1980; in one, Lindy Chamberlain killed her baby in a “crime of passion” while in the other the murder was premeditated, with Lindy atoning for her sins by sacrificing her child in the desert (379-81). Lindy Chamberlain, in her autobiography published in 1990, was scathing of Brien who, she wrote, “said we were some of the nicest people he had ever met – and claimed he was our best friend – later authored one of the most scurrilous books ever written about our case with incorrect evidence and rumours put in as fact” (*Through My Eyes* 196-200).

After her betrayal by Brien, Chamberlain sent a message from gaol to Bryson offering to tell him her version of events. Initially, she had chosen Brien over Bryson to give the in-depth interviews needed for a book and now realized her error in trusting him (Bryson Personal interview). Bryson interviewed her as well as other members of the family and was able to convey their perspective in detail. When Bryson began his research he had an agreement to write a book for Penguin, but he also covered the events as a freelance journalist for radio (FOX FM and 5DAY) and for television (Channel Nine’s then new program, *Today*) The further the case

proceeded the more convinced Bryson became of its flimsiness, but he attended around twenty parties held during the case by police and government officers involved in the prosecution. At one party he attended with a radio colleague, a senior government minister asked of Bryson “Is he one of us, or one of them?” To which his colleague replied “Oh, no, he’s on side”. After that, according to Bryson “life was easy” (Personal interview). The Australian journalists’ code of ethics does not require journalists to declare their views of events to those they write about (http://www.alliance.org.au/resources/doc_details/code_of_ethics/). By attending parties Bryson was not working as such except that he used what he learnt there about the unhealthily entwined relationships between prosecutors, the police and other journalists in the book (*Evil Angels* 394-95; 406-07). Clause eight of the code does ask journalists to gather information by fair and honest means and it could be argued that in allowing a colleague to vouch for him, Bryson indirectly deceived those involved in the prosecution of the Chamberlains. Bryson says that he wanted to be part of the media pack during the trial. “I wanted to have a lot of the same reactions that they had, so that I could understand that” but asked whether he considered making his views clear, he replied “Not for a nanosecond” (Personal interview).

Bryson says he subscribes to utilitarianism as espoused by English philosopher Jeremy Bentham in *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* in 1789 which argues that all laws should work toward the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people and that it is the consequences of people’s actions, not their intentions, that are paramount (Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 19). In the context of professional ethics, Bryson could argue that he was acting in the public interest on a matter of significance, and that his indirect deception enabled him to provide readers with information essential to understanding the compromised nature of the prosecution. Bryson chooses not to make these arguments explicitly, saying that “the closest thing that you can say is that there is a modicum of kindness about me” (Personal interview). This is easy enough to believe as, to meet, Bryson is friendly but formal, cheerful in a way that brings to mind words like chivalry and courtliness. In effect, Bryson is asking readers to trust his research methods; he was at least questioning the actions of the prosecution team rather than following what he describes as “the media pack.” Other journalists such as Brien accepted material

leaked to them by police that falsely incriminated the Chamberlains and printed it without checking it further or declaring its source (Bryson Personal interview). As Lindy Chamberlain writes in her autobiography: “What the police couldn’t say publicly about ‘white babies’ coffins’ and ‘underlined Bible texts,’ Steve did – and the myths grew” (*Through My Eyes* 200)

In representing events, Bryson chose to write in a narrative mode with an omniscient narrative voice because he wanted to make the book, already long at 550 pages, “an easy journey” for the reader. “If you want to touch a lot of people with a book, you’ve got to draw them in, with a sense of ‘Hey, come and listen to this story’” (Personal interview). Bryson’s approach certainly foregrounds the Chamberlains’ plight in ways that earlier books do not but what is lost is a sense of transparency between journalist and reader. The book’s tone is calm and even-handed, perhaps reflecting Bryson’s legal background; his questioning of the trial verdict has been vindicated by the Royal Commission and by a third coronial inquest which brought down an open finding in 1995 (Howe *Lindy Chamberlain Revisited* 4). There were numerous episodes he witnessed and wrote about but he never openly acknowledges his presence in the book. On occasion the text refers to a stringer for the *Today* show on television or the radio station FOX FM without identifying the stringer as Bryson. These events were minor and it was probably immaterial whether the person described is Bryson or someone else.

In at least one other instance, however, the reader would have benefited from knowing Bryson’s role in events. After the jury found Lindy Chamberlain guilty, Bryson writes about the parties held in Darwin. The journalists gathered at one hotel where:

The waiter refused to serve three journalists who were rolling joints on a dinner-plate in full view of a nearby party hosted by a uniformed superintendent of police. [Malcolm] Brown [of *The Sydney Morning Herald*] knew those journalists were upset with the verdict, and plainly he was observing some calculated gesture of insolence, more than anything else. When he walked through to the garden-lounge, things were peaceful enough, until two radio reporters who were

otherwise firm friends got up, grey-faced and shouting, from a poolside table and knocked each other into the water (529-530).

Bryson was one of the two grey-faced, anonymous reporters:

What happened was that there was a party at the Hotel Darwin after all the journalists had filed their stories and everyone was letting down. They were tired and getting drunk and smoking dope and I was very upset about the verdict because I thought it unfair and wrong and this other journalist, who is an old friend but I won't tell you who he is, said: 'Look, Johnny, it's not that bad really and you've got to remember that for us this is the best result, because it is a sensational story.' I thought that was cruel, so I hit him. We started fighting and punched each other into the hotel pool. (Personal interview).

The contrast between the cool, magisterial tone of the book and Bryson's violent reaction to his friend's remark is stark. This is what had struck me when Bryson first told this story to RMIT journalism students in 2001. I found it hard to imagine this slight and softly-spoken man getting so passionate about his work that he would start throwing punches, but he has said that his anger over the treatment of the Chamberlains energized him. Simons admits she was shocked when she learnt that Bryson had "played" (her term) with the relationship of trust between journalist and reader (Simons "An Exercise in Creation Non-fiction and Investigative Journalism" 24). Whether it distorts Bryson's representation of events is difficult to assess. It appears not; Bryson has an acute sense of fairness. For instance, after the jury returned its guilty verdict, defence counsel were invited to the judge's chambers. As an orderly opened the door Justice Muirhead, pouring himself a whiskey, said to them: "Well, I didn't think I exactly summed up in favour of a conviction, did you?" (*Evil Angels* 529). The orderly withdraws, "closing the door on the rest of the conversation." Bryson had been reliably told by sources what had been said in judge's chambers but chose not to report it because he distinguished between reporting an important fact about the judge's attitude and attempting to take the reader into the privacy of the judge's chambers (Personal interview). He also knew that since the trial Justice Muirhead had expressed similar views in his report to the Federal Court hearing the Chamberlains' appeal. "I took the reader to what could

have been overheard but what was said in chambers was their business. It also did not throw any *further* light on his views and thinking” (Personal interview).

The problem is, none of this decision-making is made available to the reader, either in the book, in endnotes, a note to the reader, or even in promotional interviews, which some journalists use to discuss the issues raised in researching and writing their books. Bryson says he enjoys footnotes himself but felt they would have clogged the book. In this I would argue he did himself a disservice because the available evidence shows he took great care researching and writing *Evil Angels* and his readers are asked to invest a high level of trust in his journalistic integrity over an event where many journalists had performed poorly. To learn that Bryson disguised his identity in the poolside fight provokes if not the terror that Hersey argues readers feel when journalists distort by adding invented material, then at least a sense of disquiet that comes from the reader’s desire to trust the journalist’s account of events (“The Legend on the License” 249). Bryson was writing more than two decades ago, and most practitioners of book-length journalism, particularly in Australia, had not given a lot of thought to notions of transparency.

Bryson’s use of an omniscient narrative voice gave way a decade later, in 1995, to Garner’s overtly present narrative voice in her account of a sexual harassment case at Melbourne University, *The First Stone*. Garner’s narrative voice solved some of the problems inherent in Bryson’s approach but it created others. Where Bryson’s book helped shift public sentiment about the Chamberlain case, Garner’s book cleaved public opinion and generated impassioned debate for much of the year. Some readers and critics felt Garner’s raising of “some questions about sex and power,” as the book is subtitled, had touched a deep nerve in the community; others said *The First Stone* manipulated readers’ emotions and plugged into prejudices (Taylor “Stones, Ripples, Waves” 60-104). It is described in this thesis as a work of book-length journalism but the term Garner uses in her author’s note at the beginning of the book is reportage, and the note is confusing. It says she encountered obstacles to her research that eventually forced her to write a “broader, less ‘objective,’ more personal book” and left her free to invent names for the people she writes about.

A minority read *The First Stone* as a work of fiction. Ann Curthoys, an historian, determined this on the ground that Garner had not adopted the citation and

referencing of either history or journalism (“Where is Feminism Now?” 191) even though at that time it had been relatively common for works of book-length journalism to contain no overt referencing: all but two of the twelve commonly cited works listed in chapter two – *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men* and *Newjack* – contain no endnotes. It is true, though, that the absence of endnotes, a bibliography or an index give readers fewer cues about the book’s status. Curthoys may have been obliquely referring to Garner’s first person point of view, which was what disqualified the book as journalism for Australian novelist Marion Halligan: “It’s a novel whose main character is Helen Garner, acting out the role of the journalist” (Taylor “Stones, Ripples, Waves” 77-78). Halligan’s point about what Garner does is perceptive but does not disqualify the book as journalism because numerous works of book-length journalism have been written with an overt narrative voice, including work by Didion, Mailer and Thompson. But most readers took it as non-fiction, and this was entirely to be expected. On its publication details page, *The First Stone* is classified as part of the social sciences, at 305.42. Apart from the invented names, all other factual details correlated – or purported to correlate – with specific incidents that occurred to actual people at Ormond College’s “smoko” night in 1991 that led to actual consequences. Throughout the controversy provoked by the book, supporters and detractors, readers and those involved in the case, all discussed the book as an account of real events and people.

The First Stone has sold over 73,500 copies but did not win any major literary awards, perhaps because of the controversy surrounding Garner’s research methods and how she represented people in the book (Personal interview). *The First Stone* revolves around Garner’s response to a sexual harassment case brought by two young women students against the master of their residential college. Garner’s interest in the case was sparked when she read a report of it in a newspaper and impulsively wrote a letter to the master of Ormond College, Dr Alan Gregory, expressing her sympathy for him, writing that whatever the truth of the allegations “This has been the most appallingly destructive, priggish and pitiless way of dealing with it. I want you to know that there are plenty of women out here who step back in dismay from the kind of treatment you have received” (*The First Stone* 16). Garner began investigating but the two complainants heard about the contents of her letter and refused to be interviewed, believing she did not have an open mind on the issue.

Garner continued and the drive of much of her narrative mode comes from her inability to speak to the complainants and other women at Melbourne University who supported them, notably Dr Jenna Mead, a tutor at Ormond. Garner argues that if the two young women really believe in their case they should be willing to defend it. As she struggles to understand why they went to the police over what she perceives as a minor matter compared to rape, she attacks them, in increasingly violent terms, writing that she wanted to “*shake them till their teeth rattled*” (Italics in original 168). Garner wrote her letter as a citizen, which is her right, but it is hard to see how she failed to appreciate that sending such a strongly worded letter into such an emotionally charged atmosphere would jeopardize her chances of getting interviews. It was certainly unreasonable for her to expect the young women to agree and deeply unfair to attack them so personally for their choice. It is not simply the fact that Garner was unable to interview the young women that weakens her book, but the way she treats them thereafter.

I read the book soon after its publication and like many people who knew little about the case, was swept up in Garner’s superbly crafted prose, acutely observed details and engaging, first-person style. Garner, a well-known novelist, appeared to be taking the reader into her confidence, presenting herself as an honest, reflective middle-aged woman. She had really tried to get to the bottom of the Ormond case but had been blocked by a succession of shrill, faceless, punitive feminists on campus. I did worry that it was the two young complainants who were accused of creating the problem rather than the university whose procedures had so clearly failed them, and, for that matter, Gregory. But as I read the book I found myself thinking: “You’re right, Helen; why couldn’t all those feminists have been as reasonable as you?” On 8 August 1995 Garner delivered a speech about the response to her book at the Sydney Institute and again attacked the women and their supporters for refusing to be interviewed. Mead then wrote an article that was published in *The Age* (“A player in the Ormond drama defends her cause” 17), revealing that Garner had disguised her identity in *The First Stone*, splitting Mead into six or seven people. “The effect is to suggest she is reporting the existence of a real conspiracy.” Reading this, I suddenly felt the book’s power implode. Mead was in fact Dr Ruth V (*The First Stone* 37-38), Ms Vivienne S (43), Ms Rose H (51), Mrs Barbara W (69), Ms Margaret L (82), “a thin-faced, thin-bodied, woman in her forties” (23) and perhaps two separate senior

women in the college (94, 123). There were, then, at least six conspiratorial feminists, variously described as a headmistress working over a fourth-former and a rude, secretive woman who “mined and ambushed” Garner’s path to the complainants (70-71); describing Mead as thin-faced and thin-bodied invokes Julius Caesar’s suspicion of Cassius’ “lean and hungry look” in Shakespeare’s eponymous play (Act 1, scene 2, line 191).

A number of journalists and commentators, including me, began commenting on this in the news media (Neill “Garner Hype Goes too Far;” Ricketson “The Demidenko-Darville and Garner controversies;” Toohey “Stone’s Bad-throw: Six-into-one Doesn’t Go”). Later, for a book about *The First Stone* controversy edited by Mead, I wrote an essay about Garner’s journalism that was subsequently included in an anthology of postwar Australian literary criticism (Bird, Dixon and Lee *Authority and Influence* 291-95). Material on Garner in this chapter draws on that essay. Garner acknowledged in a letter to *The Age* on 23 September 1995 that she had given Mead half a dozen or so separate names in the book, and when the speech Garner had given about the Ormond case was reprinted in a selection of her journalism the following year, she added a paragraph saying she had been obliged to split up Mead by her publisher’s lawyers who feared a lawsuit. She had agreed with the greatest reluctance and regretted her actions because it had given some readers the idea that her book was “fictionalized.” She wrote: “It is not a novel. Except for this one tactic to avoid defamation, it is reportage.” When Garner’s speech was printed in the Sydney Institute’s journal, *The Sydney Papers*, she had added a postscript defending her actions. She wrote that she did not believe Mead was the sole supporter of the two complainants but “this does not mean that I think there was ‘a conspiracy’ at work. At no point have I ever believed, nor have I suggested, that the Ormond events were fomented by ‘a conspiracy’ of feminists.” (Ricketson “Helen Garner’s *The First Stone*” 91-92).

It is difficult to see how the chopping up of one woman into at least six different identities could not have an impact on how people read the book, especially as the issue had been made central to the book’s narrative mode. There are at least twenty five passages that directly or indirectly suggest a feminist conspiracy in the Ormond case: on pages 39, 48, 54, 61, 65, 66-67, 69, 71, 77, 79, 88, 89, 93, 96, 100, 137, 145, 153, 168, 177, 178, 181, 202, 204 and 218. The book is riddled with phrases like “the

faceless group of women in the wider university who supported the two complainants” (39). The rhetoric of some sentences is loaded: “The warmth of her manner on the phone had congealed into the permafrost of a feminist who’d been shown my letter to Colin Shepherd [the pseudonym she gave Gregory in the book]” (96) and “But feminism too is a conduit for Eros...It is not the exclusive property of a priggish, literal-minded vengeance squad that gets Eros in its sights, gives him both barrels and marches away in its Blundstones, leaving the gods’ messenger sprawled in the mud with his wings all bloody and torn” (202). Garner’s attempt to hold the feminist conspiracy charge at arm’s length is misleading; she gives Gregory’s allegation of a feminist conspiracy a sympathetic reading by remarking that “Whenever I’ve spoken to Colin Shepherd I’ve been struck by the absence of anger in his demeanour or tone” (79). A later passage contradicts her letter to *The Age*: “I asked him [the acting master of the college] if he thought that the feminist group in Ormond which had organized against Colin Shepherd might have formed in opposition to this blokish element in the college” (218).

A re-reading of *The First Stone* allows the reader to see that perhaps in the original manuscript there was a sharper distinction drawn between the frustration Garner felt at being refused an interview by Mead and the repulsion she felt towards various women on campus, the so-called “priggish, literal-minded vengeance squad.” But the affect of splitting Mead into at least six people in the text is to conflate these frustrations and imprint “feminist conspiracy” on the reader’s mind. The reader, therefore, is misled, or when Garner’s action is revealed, the faith or, to use Garner’s own term, the “contract” between journalist and reader is ruptured (*True Stories* 6-7). Garner deeply regrets acceding to the lawyer’s advice. “It was a flaw in my method. It shows that when the chips are down I was a coward and it distorted the nature of the story, just that bit, but it was a crucial bit” (Personal interview). I said that when I read that Mead had been split into six people, I felt as a reader I had lost my bearings. She replied: “That is the worst thing about it. That is the basis of my regret, that it violates the contract with the reader” (Personal interview). Garner also said there was a surprising number of women who would not speak to her for the book but even accepting this, the addition of an extra half dozen women made the conspiracy seem larger than it actually was. With the revelation of the splitting up of Mead, the rhetorical force of Garner’s argument collapses, which, coupled with her

unfair treatment of the two young women, seriously undermines the credibility of *The First Stone*.

This is a pity because Garner has an extraordinary ability to unfold the meaning of unexamined everyday events. One memorable scene in *The First Stone* is the hearing in the County Court of a (successful) appeal against Gregory's conviction for indecent assault. Garner attended and enacted the advice of Henry James that she quotes: "Be someone on whom nothing is lost." She notices the sarcasm beneath the barrister's use of the chivalrous word "madam" in cross-examining one of the two complainants, and the needle beneath his elaborate show of ignorance of how young women wear their hair today; the two "Ormond men" who push hard against Garner's legs as they seek to sit behind Gregory, and the "strange reflex of helpfulness" that prompts Mrs Gregory to look around her for a chair when, from the witness box, one of the young women who had accused her husband of sexual harassment, asks for a seat (*The First Stone*, 24-31). Most journalists would unconsciously censor this oddly poignant detail but Garner seizes on such moments, which has characterized her approach to journalism, whether in feature articles or books (Ricketson "Helen Garner's *The First Stone*" 94-5). The emotions that readers of Garner's work feel when reading such closely observed and intimate behaviour is something readers value highly but it also raises the ethical stakes, precisely because her writing lodges deep in readers' imaginations. In her next work of book-length journalism, *Joe Cinque's Consolation*, which concerned the killing of Cinque by his then girlfriend Anu Singh, Garner attended Singh's trial in an effort to understand her actions. One morning during the trial while those in court wait for the judge to arrive, Garner watches as Singh puts up her hair.

Although her back was turned to us, it was an almost indecently intimate and histrionic display, a series of age-old, deeply feminine gestures. First, the raising of both arms and the gathering of the hair in two hands. Then the twisting and rolling and flicking and doubling back of its dark mass, redder towards the tips, into a thick club; the binding of it with a broad black stretchy band; then the patting, the sensitive roaming of the flattened palms against the smooth round curve of her head; the feeling for loose strands at the temples and the anchoring of them over and behind the ears. All was in order.

Satisfied, the small flexible hands flew up, out, and down to her lap, where they would lie, hour after hour, neatly clasped and occasionally twisting, while her inner life (or lack of it), her disturbances, her madnesses and cruelties were stripped bare and paraded before a small, intent cluster of strangers (46).

Reviewers were divided about this passage when the book was published in 2004. In *The Australian* Emma-Kate Symons, a staff journalist, wrote that she was mesmerized by the “intimate domestic detail” in the passage, which reminded her of paintings by the seventeenth century artist Jan Vermeer (“Inside the Skin”). Maryanne Dever, director of the Centre for Women’s Studies and Gender Research at Monash University, found the passage manipulative. “Singh’s pleasing appearance becomes a finely calibrated measure of her apparent moral degeneracy, and as she sits in court the arrangement of her fine, serpent-like limbs and her ‘dark mass of hair’ are obsessively monitored by Garner” (“Hanging Out for Judgement?”). Garner defends the passage:

It wasn’t as if I sat there looking at her thinking, ‘Now, what did she do today to make her look narcissistic?’ It doesn’t work like that. One of the things that makes courts interesting is that there *is* a mode of behaviour, there is a glaze of formality over everything, and what people do to disrupt that glaze is very interesting and it tells you a lot about them. For Anu Singh to do something *that* intimate, that intensely feminine in the middle of a court room where she was on trial for murder was, for me, completely staggering (Personal interview).

For Garner, then, the description is not gratuitous but relevant and representative of what she observed of Singh. That Garner had such a visceral response to the sight of a woman re-arranging her hair in court may say something about her, as she acknowledged in the interview, but for Dever to describe Garner’s first-hand observation as “obsessively” monitoring Singh says something about her too. The ethical choices journalists make in what to include and how in their books are not neutral. In my view, Garner’s choice in this instance was defensible, but also shows

how her journalism is primarily driven by her personal response to people, events and issue.

Other journalists, of course, respond to people and events personally but Garner's extraordinarily intimate mode of representing people plus her apparently vulnerable, confessional narrative voice place her near one end of the continuum of possible ways to write book-length journalism. Her narrative voice is central to both *The First Stone* and *Joe Cinque's Consolation*, which, combined with her literary talent, enables her to write books that are deeply engaging for many readers. As Goldsworthy perceptively notes, Garner is one of few writers who could attract a mass audience with a book debating feminist theory and gender relations (*Helen Garner* 82). The danger shadowing this rare quality in Garner's work is, first, that Garner does not do the kind of detailed research that characterizes successful book-length journalism ("Helen Garner's *The First Stone*" 95-99) and, second, that her highly personal approach leaves itself open to the charge that she believes her subjective response is more important than the events she is writing about, or, at its strongest, that she is preying on other people's misfortunes for her own edification.

Where Garner's work provokes discussion and position-taking, and Bryson's *Evil Angels* was influential in shifting public opinion, Blackburn's *Broken Lives* was the prime impetus for the re-opening of the cases against John Button who had been convicted in 1963 of the manslaughter of Rosemary Anderson, aged seventeen, and Darryl Beamish who had been convicted in 1961 of the murder of Jillian Brewer, aged twenty-two, even though another man, Eric Edgar Cooke, had confessed to killing both women. Cooke, though, was a convicted serial killer and his confessions were disbelieved or ignored by police who had already obtained confessions from Button and Beamish. Button was sentenced to ten years and Beamish life imprisonment after his initial death sentence was commuted. A chance meeting between Button and Blackburn in 1991 at a dancing class sparked her interest in the cases. Her research showed that the police case against Button and Beamish had been misguided, perhaps deliberately so, that Cooke's confession had been sincere and that he was responsible for running down and injuring seven more young women. These cases, however, had not been connected by police with the running down and killing of Anderson (*End of Innocence* 1-3, 81). *Broken Lives* prompted calls in the West Australian parliament for the cases to be re-opened, which eventually were

heeded despite opposition from the police. In 2002 Button's conviction was quashed in the West Australian Court of Criminal Appeal, making legal history as the longest standing conviction in Australia to be overturned. Three years later the same result was achieved for Beamish (*End of Innocence* 3-4). Rarely do works of book-length journalism have such a specific, substantial affect.

In 2007 Blackburn wrote a book entitled *End of Innocence* that reflects candidly and, for a journalist, at rare length on the issues, both professional and personal, that came up as she researched and wrote *Broken Lives*, which has sold more than forty thousand copies (Blackburn "Finding Narrative Form"). In chronicling her campaign, from her first meeting with Button to the aftermath of the quashed convictions, Blackburn discusses her research methods, how she represented what she found and responses to *Broken Lives*. It is soon clear she approached her investigation thoroughly and thoughtfully, interviewing more than one hundred and sixty people and uncovering a wide range of police, judicial and government documents. As she sought out the young women who had been run down but not killed by Cooke, she felt both "a journalist's excitement at what information I might glean" and nervousness about the "shock and pain I would evoke" by asking them to revisit painful memories (*End of Innocence* 95). During some of these interviews she found herself crying along with her interviewees (149). Both Button and Beamish had been wrongfully convicted, she believed, but *Broken Lives* focuses overwhelmingly on Button's case because he and his family were willing to take part but Beamish's family was not (249). Even the Buttons were willing to be involved only if Cooke's widow, Sally, supported the project, which she did after Blackburn discussed it with her (*End of Innocence* 27-28, 45).

These actions demonstrate Blackburn's care for those she was writing about; she was confronted by even more difficult ethical decisions as the process continued. Button and Anderson, his girlfriend, were enjoying his nineteenth birthday until a misunderstood remark led to an argument. Walking home along the road, Anderson was run down by Cooke. The prosecution case had been that Button had made advances but Anderson resisted and, in a rage, Button hit her with his car. More than two years after Button had met Blackburn, Button told her that he and Anderson had been having sex for three months before her death (145). Button had not told anyone this because of the then taboo on pre-marital sex and because he "wanted to protect

Rosemary's honour and I didn't want to hurt her parents any more than they were hurting already. But you have to know everything. I trust you to do the right thing with it" (146). Blackburn was moved by Button's trust and convinced of his honesty as the revelation went so much against his interests. But she also believed she had to use the information because it was vital to proving his innocence. She offered to continue research but not publish anything until after Anderson's parents had died. He then agreed to let her use it, trusting her to treat it sensitively (148).

Where Blackburn carefully balanced her goal of disclosing as much information as possible with a duty of care toward Button, she acknowledges she was not as sensitive to the needs of the Anderson family who for four decades had believed Button had killed their daughter and were being told this was wrong. Early on she had told them that her investigation would have been easier if they were dead, meaning that they would not have to confront the pain of giving up their long held belief but her "clumsy comment" intensified the Andersons' feeling that "their daughter had been metaphorically dug out of her grave and tossed around in the air by the media, and they had no part in it" (303). Perhaps the obsessiveness that drove Blackburn's campaign to overturn Button and Beamish's convictions also blinded her to the Andersons' plight. Researching and writing *Broken Lives* occupied her for more than six years; it is presented as an act of advocacy, making clear from the first sentence of the preface her belief that Button was the victim of a grave miscarriage of justice (*Broken Lives* 1). Even so, by the evidence of *End of Innocence*, Blackburn did well managing the relationships she had with a broad range of sources, many of whom had been traumatized by Cooke's actions.

Broken Lives reconstructs the accounts of the individual hit-and-run victims, and tracks between Button's life and Cooke's crimes and his execution in 1964. The book's editor, Zoltan Kovacs, said the first draft read like a "series of police rounds stories" (*End of Innocence* 185) prompting Blackburn to rewrite, trying to "colour it up" and "breathe life into the characters" (*End of Innocence* 163). At Kovacs' urging she attempted to write an interior monologue for Cooke, not to excuse him but in an effort to explain (193). She interviewed a psychologist and two psychiatrists who knew Cooke and sought to imagine his thought processes as he committed each of his many crimes:

A powerful new urge stole over him, rising from the deep bitterness within. He felt a surge of irresistible excitement as the idea took shape. It was more than his usual need to mock the mockers by taking the things they held dear. This was more – this was an urge for more power and a realization that he had more power (*Broken Lives* 46)

It was over. He'd had his fill of revenge. That feeling left him – that feeling of power that made him light, coming over him like a mantle or cloud, telling him he must use the gun. He didn't know where it came from, his heart or his head, but it was strong – stronger than an impulse or an urge; a power as though he was God, with power over life and death (164).

She was sleeping on top of the bed, wearing just a flimsy nightie; virtually nothing to hide her nakedness. The feeling that had been stirring all night grew stronger. It was a balmy night, thoughts of young love had been on his mind since the previous day.... He could have her and avenge himself again (219).

Blackburn felt she had restored Cooke's humanity rather than repeat his tabloid portrayal as the cold-blooded Nedlands Monster (*End of Innocence* 193). The attempt is sincere but to me the interior monologues reads like a Gothic novel, in phrases such as "a powerful new urge stole over him," "that feeling of power," "telling him he must use the gun," "thoughts of young love had been on his mind" and "he could have her and avenge himself again." Cooke's family complained to her after the book's publication for "daring to know what their father was thinking" (231). She sympathized and explained her intention. She asked the family to specify what was wrong in her portrayal of Cooke and interpreted their silence as suggesting "an emotional basis to their complaint" (232).

Another way to interpret their silence is that they were unable to say what was wrong because they did not know what their father was thinking before he committed crimes for the simple reason that they were not him. That points to the difficulty of writing an interior monologue in book-length journalism. To attempt an interior monologue of someone who is not only dead but responsible for horrific crimes –

Cooke committed necrophilia with the woman described in the passage above – seems close to impossible to achieve. The potential benefit of gaining at least some understanding of Cooke seems outweighed both by the likelihood of offending the surviving families and appearing to be voyeuristic. In my assessment, *Broken Lives* will be remembered for the life-changing impact it had on the lives of Button and Beamish whereas *Evil Angels* is remembered not only for its persuasive upending of received wisdom about the Chamberlain case but for the skill of Bryson’s writing, which draws the reader deep into the events at Uluru in 1980 and their meaning.

Blackburn’s achievement, while rare and laudable, was focused on a narrow goal; the achievement of Marr and Wilkinson in their 2003 book, *Dark Victory*, is to provide a comprehensively documented, highly readable challenge to the response of the federal government led by Prime Minister John Howard to the arrival of asylum-seekers on Australia’s northern shores just weeks before he called an election. The 2001 federal election was the third of four consecutive elections that Howard, leading the Liberal National Party coalition, would win before his government lost office, and the PM his seat, in 2007. *Dark Victory* is not a work of polemic as it is written in a narrative mode but it is clearly the work of two politically engaged journalists who, after investigating the events in question, have reached firm conclusions that are infused throughout their chronologically organized narrative mode. The returned government and its supporters did not agree with the journalists’ evidence or findings but no lawsuits were lodged. Government ministers made no comment about the book, but nor were they pressed about it by daily journalists as *Dark Victory* was launched during the week that the United States invaded Iraq in March 2003. Most reviews were strongly favourable (Fitzgerald; Fraser; Sally Murphy), although at least one self-described cultural warrior, Andrew Bolt of *The Herald Sun*, launched an ad hominem attack on Marr that began: “A new book on the Tampa 'scandal' proves our cultural elite prefers orgasmic moralising to analysis” and expresses astonishment that Marr could be “so gleefully cruel, mocking even how people look or speak” while in the same sentence labelling Marr a “bouffant moralist,” which along with the strange use of “orgasmic” carries homophobic undertones about the openly gay Marr (“*Dark Victory*: Credibility Goes Overboard”).

How did Marr make ethical choices about representing what he had found? Marr wrote *Dark Victory* with Wilkinson, who is an experienced, Walkley-award winning

journalist and author of a biography of former Labor powerbroker Graham Richardson. Unlike Bernstein on *The Final Days*, Wilkinson was a full co-author, but I am focusing on Marr's work because he has written six books to Wilkinson's two and because his three years of presenting *Media Watch* gives him insight into journalistic practice, which he articulates well. His statements about *Dark Victory* reflect both their views (Personal interview). Marr believes a journalist writing a book is just as obliged to reach conclusions as they are to investigate an issue from as many perspectives as possible. He points to the American biographer of Joyce, Richard Ellmann, who, he says, is more concerned to lay out fifteen views of his subject than offer his own. "It drives me beserk. Mr Ellmann, you have been studying this subject for years, you've read everything on it, you've talked to the descendents, you've read the letters, what do *you* think? (Personal interview).

Marr says he has an "explainer's imagination" rather than a "creator's imagination." He enjoys the possibility in book-length journalism of taking readers into new and complex areas. Marr and Wilkinson interviewed numerous asylum-seekers and gained important testimony from them, but they did not need to become close to them in the way that Blackburn did with the Button family. Much of the material in the book came from documents, whether government documents obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, academic papers on refugee policy or, most extensively, the volumes of witness statements and testimony for the Senate Select Committee on what was coyly entitled A Certain Maritime Incident. Much of this material goes unreported in the news media even when it is being covered daily, as the committee's hearings were. Marr, like some other practitioners of book-length journalism, sees the potential in such seemingly unpromising raw material. "If you bring all these sticks and old boxes together, these branches and rubble and some old newspapers, you can put it all together in a heap and if you know how to build a fire with narrative, it *will* ignite, like a bonfire" (Personal interview). Marr's "explainer's imagination" enables him to sift through the thousands of pages of material to find the key threads of the events – the proximity of the arriving asylum-seekers to an election, the pitting of longstanding maritime codes against a political leader willing to push conventions and rules to breaking point, the misuse of intelligence services, the government's suborning of the military for political ends, the dehumanizing of the asylum-seekers' plight by preventing journalists from photographing them and

the setting up of an expensive, political rather than public policy-driven scheme to process asylum-seekers, the Pacific Solution.

The book deals with urgent public issues and its events are well known, but it reads like a novel, which is reflected in dust-jacket copy's description of the book as "a thrilling and provocative account of events." Later editions reprinted excerpts from critics agreeing: "When a non-fiction book reads like the scariest, most horrifying thriller, you know you're on a winner" (*Sunday Telegraph*), "A gripping, ripping yarn – alive with detail and rich in analysis" (*Eureka Street*), and, in *The Age*, former foreign correspondent and Pulitzer prize-winning novelist Geraldine Brooks, described it as a "breathtaking read." To Marr, these were compliments. He wanted *Dark Victory* to reach the broadest possible audience but its subject matter – federal politics and immigration – are "such relentlessly uncongenial material" that he believed the book needed to be written like a thriller if it were to have any chance of engaging a broad audience, and in this he and Wilkinson succeeded, selling more than thirty-five thousand over two editions (Personal interview). Marr was not wanting to reach a broad audience for the sake of it, or for commercial success, but because he believed the issues were important and that they should be discussed with a deeper understanding of the meaning of events that had taken place amid the clamour of competing voices in the election and against the backdrop of the shocking terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center that killed just under 3000 people. *Dark Victory*, then, does not read like an escapist thriller but one that fully engages the reader's mind and emotions because the journalists have made a narrative out of a vast amount of material. By the end of its 293 pages the book prompts, in me and many other readers, a boiling outrage at how dishonestly the government had acted and how ruthlessly it had manipulated the flow of information to its citizens during an election campaign. As Marr says, "We thought that if we presented the facts in a compelling narrative, the result in a fair observer would be fury and shame" (Personal interview).

Marr and Wilkinson's book is their interpretation of events and as such is open to debate; unlike Bryson's *Evil Angels*, though, *Dark Victory* provides readers with ample means to scrutinize its sourcing and methods. It has twenty-eight pages of endnotes that source information to particular documents, papers and interviews. With the exception of seven sources granted anonymity, all others are named (294-

321). The journalists also include six pages of acknowledgements that provide more detail on how they obtained information, and thank those who spoke to them off the record. Governments change hands for many reasons but at least one strand of the growing disaffection with Howard's eleven year old conservative government was how it dealt with asylum-seekers. *Dark Victory* played a key role in articulating and cementing in readers a belief that Howard had drawn on longstanding and deep-seated fears in Australians about border security to take electoral advantage of the arriving asylum-seekers. This belief was readily called up by three words – “Tampa” and “children overboard” (Brett *Exit Right* 33-34, 37). The first referred to a Norwegian freighter, which, obeying the code of seafarers, picked up asylum-seekers on board a leaking boat, the Palapa, but was prevented by the government from landing them on Australian shores. The second referred to an incident on board another boat in which an unconfirmed and later discredited report that asylum-seekers were throwing their children overboard to force Australian navy ships to rescue them was fanned by the government, including the prime minister who said: “I don't want people like that in Australia. Genuine refugees don't do that” (*Dark Victory* 189).

A few months after *Dark Victory* was published, Simons examined another episode in what has been called the culture wars that characterized Australian intellectual life in the 1990s and into this century. Like Marr, she has also scrutinized her colleagues in the news media, but where Marr has great confidence in his ability to persuade others to his point of view, Simons presents a less certain persona in her book-length journalism, often foregrounding her uneasiness about the limits of what can be known about an event or issue and picking at the unexamined assumptions underlying people's justifications for their actions. This outlook is epitomized in *The Meeting of the Waters*, which re-investigated the Hindmarsh Island affair. The case concerned two developers' plans to build a bridge across to Hindmarsh Island from the South Australian coast; the plans were initially blocked by the Aboriginal Affairs minister, Robert Tickner, after women of the Ngarrindjeri people protested that the island held spiritual significance for them as the site of secrets known only to women to do with childbirth, menstruation and burial of the dead. Another group of Ngarrindjeri women came forward saying the “secret women's business” was fabricated, and their views were accepted by a Royal Commission. The

commission's findings were used as ammunition by conservative newspaper columnists, and others, to further their argument that the federal Labor government, of which Tickner was a member, was soft-headed about indigenous people, putting more weight on spiritual beliefs of a minority group squabbling among themselves than on the developers' legal property rights. The developers brought a lawsuit against the federal government but, ironically, it was this case, heard in the Federal Court, in 2001, that found the Royal Commission's findings substantially flawed. It was not within the court's remit to make a finding about validity of the controversial secret women's business, but Justice John von Doussa was clear that "it had not been proved that it had been fabricated" (*Meeting of the Waters* 452).

Simons enjoyed the advantage common among practitioners of book-length journalism of finding valuable information in the Royal Commission and Federal Court cases that daily journalists had not had time to fully digest, and, because she was willing and able to spend time, she gained access to Aboriginal women who had not spoken to other journalists in any detail. It was only after she had spoken to several people that Simons was invited to meet Sandra Saunders, a prominent local Aboriginal woman, who unknown to her, was a friend of Doreen Kartinyeri, the senior Ngarrindjeri woman most closely identified with the women's business. Saunders offered to meet Simons at her home rather than at her Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement office; when Simons arrived she noticed all the Aboriginal women involved in the issue were also arriving, in taxis. One who ran an Aboriginal resource and welfare centre:

[S]houted at me for about twenty minutes. The outrageousness of the Royal Commission. How white people knew nothing. How could I assume I knew enough to write this book? The other women sat and listened to her, and watched how I took all this. I knew enough to shut up and take it. Eventually one of the other women laid a hand on [Muriel] Van Der Byl's knee. The gesture was very clear. Enough. The women began to ask me questions about myself. When I told them I had two children, Daisy Rankine spoke for the first time. 'Ah, busy woman.' She smiled at me. Things went better after that (132).

After being “interviewed” by the Aboriginal women, Simons was allowed to arrange individual interviews. Simons had not covered the Hindmarsh Island case as it unfolded in the daily news media and so brought no particular knowledge of the issues but this disadvantage was offset by the recognition among various people involved in what had become a bitter partisan struggle that she was not seen as allied to any party (Personal interview).

She was anxious to continue to be seen as unaligned to any group, even though in the end Simons’ book strongly argues that the supporters of the “secret women’s business,” especially Kartinyeri, were treated almost as badly by the judiciary, the news media and the professional experts – in this case, anthropologists – as Lindy Chamberlain had been more than a decade beforehand. When she first met the Aboriginal women she had already examined the Royal Commission’s report, and evidence presented to it, and found it wanting but knew because of the trenchant support given it by various commentators that anything she wrote questioning it would be attacked. “I knew it was essential for the credibility of the story that the journalism had integrity. I wanted to understand the Ngarrindjeri women’s point of view and I certainly wanted information from them but I didn’t want anybody to be able to say that I was doing the book for them” (Personal interview). She stressed this to them the first evening she met them, in 1999, saying she did not know whether the “secret women’s business” was fabricated, though she says she did express her doubts about the Royal Commission. When writing her book, Simons checked Kartinyeri’s quotations with her but none of the women or any other people represented in the book had power of veto over its contents (Personal interview).

Simons maintained the independence that journalists value but during the four years she worked on the book she came to question the assumptions underpinning it. “Journalists and their sources are human beings, and the boundaries between empathy and independence are always complicated” (266). The use of a Royal Commission to inquire into spiritual beliefs is an irony that underlies much of *The Meeting of the Waters*; a further, unspoken irony is the intense scrutiny of Aboriginal spirituality but of no other spirituality, such as Christianity. The commission, steeped in Enlightenment ideals of rational thought and objective inquiry, struggled to understand the complex relationships between land, people, and culture in Aboriginal society and how these relationships evolve over time, taking account of changing

circumstances since the arrival of Europeans at the end of the eighteenth century (397-399). Opponents of the secret women's business viewed suspiciously its proponents' revealing of secret knowledge in stages; to them, this seemed like a way of changing the story to make it more likely to persuade a government minister to recognize its special status. Journalists covering the issue found this reasoning persuasive. "Why didn't they just stick to one thing, and they would probably have gotten away with it" one told Simons (219). Apart from the sense of cultural superiority ingrained in these remarks, Simons notes how galling it is to journalists for events to remain hidden. "Secrets exist in order to be uncovered, and published on the front page. It is particularly important that powerful people's secrets be revealed. This is called accountability" (219-20). Yet, this is not the only purpose of secret knowledge, as the Ngarrindjeri's beliefs and practices demonstrate, she writes. Simons agonized over how much of the secret women's business to include in her book. By commonly agreed journalistic standards anything that had been put on the public record could be used, but Ngarrindjeri people had been upset by what some anthropologists had already revealed and among the Ngarrindjeri there were different views too. Simons tries to pick her way through this minefield but admits that it is impossible for all those involved to agree with her editorial choices. What she decides to do is make this plain to readers, in the first paragraph of an author's note (xii), and elsewhere (220). She also points to how she has written about "white men's secrets here as well, because our society and our attitude to knowledge are not as transparent as we like to think. I have offended uniformly" (221).

The Meeting of the Waters is written in a narrative mode but instead of an omniscient narrator Simons adopts an open first person narrative voice. In this, Simons resembles Garner. Simons' persona is reflexive, sometimes self-consciously so, but also unafraid to confront difficult issues, as the passages just quoted show. The anxieties she expresses are more tightly tied to the issues she is writing about than is evident in Garner's narrative voice. Simons sees her narrative voice as a representation of herself that she wants to be as accurate as those of other people she writes about (Personal interview). Her questioning of herself and her practices in the book are not simply or not only a rhetorical stance, but an expression of her subjectivity and her struggles with the many nebulous strands of the issues she writes about. They are characteristic of her work; in *Fit to Print*, for instance, her 1999

book about the workings of Australia's parliamentary press gallery in Canberra, her research prompts from journalists angry and defensive responses that she does not relegate to endnotes but foregrounds in the text, including a prickly exchange with a senior journalist, Dennis Shanahan of *The Australian*, with a level of detail that seems wearying but is both relevant and, ultimately, revealing (31-34). In *The Meeting of the Waters* Simons, unlike Garner, also makes full use of paratextual material such as an author's note and acknowledgements (three pages), endnotes and references (twenty-five pages), a timeline (seven pages), a cast of characters (eight pages) and a map, to make the nature and the depth of her research accessible to readers. What becomes clear in a reading of the book is her deep-seated commitment to investigating the issue with an open mind and a similar commitment to balancing her obligations to a wide range of sources with her obligations to readers. She achieved her goal, which means *The Meeting of the Waters* has been recognized as the most thorough, fair-minded and revelatory account of the Hindmarsh Island affair; it won the Queensland Premier's prize for best non-fiction book in 2003. Several reviews were favourable and several others savaged the book but did not deal with the substance of her argument and evidence, as she documents in the exegesis she wrote about the book as part of her PhD: "Much of the rhetoric surrounding the 'history wars' circulates around respect for fact, and for argument. [Ron] Brunton, [Christopher] Pearson, [Paul] Sheehan, [Geoffrey] Partington, [Chris] Kenny and others appeal to Enlightenment values and eschew ideology. I believe they have failed their own standards" (37). Simons has not been sued even though she is sharply critical of several people involved in the case, especially Pearson, a columnist for *The Weekend Australian*, who campaigned against the secret women's business, Kenny, a television journalist who aired an interview that distorted the views of the husband of a woman questioning the secret business, and Brunton, an anthropologist critical of the Ngarrindjeri women (Personal interview).

Simons' book documents how poorly the Ngarrindjeri women were treated, but she also reported divisions among the women and how some were their own worst enemies. One of their supporters was a local white historian named Betty Fisher who had collected oral histories of the Ngarrindjeri in the 1960s. She appeared reluctantly before the Royal Commission because, writes Simons, "she respected Aboriginal culture much more than her own" to the point of idealizing it (131). Her evidence

supporting the existence of secret women's business was torn apart under cross-examination (360-61) but although Simons believes Fisher was a "ghastly witness" (Personal interview) she describes in the book an interview she has with Fisher that both provides a context for the reader to understand Fisher's perspective and shows how her firmly held beliefs could be waylaid at the Royal Commission. Simons reports that Fisher's house is untidy with books, newspapers, photographs and shopping lists strewn across her kitchen table (129-31). When Simons sent Fisher a draft of this section of the book, Fisher was offended but Simons took out only a word or two. After publication, Simons says Fisher told her "Oh, all the [Ngarrindjeri] women told me not to be so silly worrying about it, but I suppose the truth hurts" (Personal interview). Simons knew Fisher would be upset but also felt the passage was important and relevant. "I read the transcript of the evidence before I met her, and she comes across as a silly old sad sack but when you actually met her, of course, there was a much more complex and interesting picture" (Personal interview).

Her achievement did not come without cost, not least to herself; she spent several months before and after the book's publication worried that if she was sued personally she would need to sell her house to fund a legal defence (Speech about *The Meeting of the Waters*). Simons is a talented writer but her express commitment to the integrity of the journalism means that she felt the need to set out her interpretation of events and issues in exhaustive detail over more than five hundred pages to ensure the book was defensible against its likely critics. It withstood the attacks of Pearson and Brunton, among others, and given the atmosphere embittering national debate at the time this was both a prudent and journalistically necessary decision. It does mean the book is too long and, in parts, too dense for at least some of the readers Simons wanted to reach, which perhaps explains its sales of 2000 copies, but Simons preferred this to weakening the book's underpinnings for the sake of pace or a simpler narrative mode (Personal interview). As she notes wryly: "The problem with the Hindmarsh Island Bridge Affair is that there are so many characters. If this were fiction, one would surely amalgamate a few" (99). Simons' *The Meeting of the Waters* was an important book in the context of the culture wars, fulfilling the role of book-length journalism as contributing to public debates. A second strand of its success, though, in my view, is that it moves beyond the

narrowly framed argument about whether secret women's business was fabricated to inquire into questions of culture, knowledge and power in Aboriginal and white Australian society ethically, rigorously and with flair.

That both *The First Stone* and *The Meeting of the Waters* are shaped by the threat of defamation action underlines the extent to which libel laws impinge on the structure and content of book-length journalism. Malcolm Knox's *Secrets of the Jury Room*, like *The First Stone* before it, exemplifies the extent to which legal problems can create ethical problems. Knox's book toggles between three themes: it outlines the nature of the jury system and makes suggestions for improvement; it offers a first-hand account of one juror's experience in a criminal trial, and it recounts the trial. As he deals with these three elements, Knox's writing moves continually between the expository mode, first person point of view and a narrative mode. The book offers a rare insight into the inner workings of the jury room; unlike in the United States where jurors can, and are, interviewed by the news media, in Australia it is a criminal offence for jurors to publicly discuss their deliberations during a trial and even afterwards. The case in which Knox was a juror ended in late 2001 and he finished his manuscript the following May but the lawyers for Knox's publishers, Random House, opposed publication until all appeals had been heard, which took three years. Even then, the lawyers insisted Knox change names and details to make the case unrecognizable to general readers. The book was eventually published in 2005, selling around 5000 copies (Personal interview). It was critically well received, especially by members of the legal community starved of information, as distinct from rumour, about what happens in jury rooms (Richter Rev. of *Secrets of the Jury Room*; Mende "Gaining a healthy respect for the jury"). The next year the book won the Alex Buzo award for the quality of its research (Personal interview). *Secrets of the Jury Room* is an informative, engaging work of book-length journalism that despite the nominally forbidden nature of its contents gives readers clear signposts about what is being read. There are nineteen pages of endnotes, a four page bibliography, an eleven page index and, at the front of the book, a nine page author's note setting out the terms and conditions of the proposed reading experience.

It is in this note that the knottiest ethical issue arises. The opening sentence reads "Australians haven't read a book like this before" before outlining Knox's predicament: how to do what journalists want to – put as much interesting

information into the public domain as possible – without falling foul of the law. The secrecy surrounding the Australian jury system, and debate about that secrecy, gives Knox's work the weight of acting in the public interest, but the law is explicit; he cannot write about deliberations and he cannot identify the accused for fear of prejudicing any trials in which the accused might appear that bear even the slightest resemblance to the original trial. Eventually Knox decides to blur the identities of both jurors and the accused.

I must work on him with a novelist's skills: cobble him together out of ghosts, memories, fantasies, and little bits of real people. Consequently, he's become someone completely different. His life story is different. The context of the accusations against him is different, his lawyer is different, the witnesses for and against him are different. No future juror can recognize him or prejudge him because – dear hypothetical rogue juror – the man you will read about in these pages is not J [a pseudonym for the accused] at all. You don't know what is real and what I'm making up. He's become a character from a writer's imagination. And the discussions in the jury room that I'll talk about are also the magic lantern show of imagination (xi)

Having tattooed this caveat on the reader's forehead, Knox writes: "While the details are embroidered, however, what follows is an honest account of my own experience as a juror" (xi). Honesty notwithstanding, the effect of the caveat is to make the reader think: how do I know which details are real and which are embroidered, and why would I care about a fictionalized case?

These questions begin to press on the reader's mind as the book proceeds and the account unfolds. Knox relates the story of the trial in small sections, regularly digressing to discuss the jury system. To sustain reader interest, he keeps moving between the intrinsically less exciting material on the operation of the jury system to the story of the trial and to the view backstage in the jury room. This is a shrewd narrative strategy but readers find themselves increasingly drawn to the details of the attempted murder case in which a confident, appealing American film producer pursues his ex-wife and their young son to Tasmania where the ex-wife has resumed a relationship with an aggressive gay woman. The film producer, whose moderately

successful career has been sliding, devises a ploy of serving a subpoena on himself for the attempted kidnapping of his son so that he can remain in Australia and try and monitor his son while awaiting a Family Court custody hearing. While in gaol he conspires to hire a man to kill his wife and her lover. How is the reader to take this account? The reader has been encouraged to identify with Knox as an everyman juror and is mindful that the defining feature of the jury system is that with few exceptions any citizen can be called up and required to serve. If the account of the case is invented, it seems like pretty tacky stuff. If it is grounded in fact, the reader is beginning to think, ‘This is amazing. It’s like something out of a movie, but it is real. I wonder what I would have felt in that jury room?’

At this point readers may well recall Knox’s note explicitly telling them they would not know what is real and what is imagined, and may well become frustrated. Knox acknowledged this when I put it to him and said that he actually changed very few of the case details but, legally, he was unable to let readers know; this he found frustrating “for exactly that sense of losing your moorings as a reader” (Personal interview). He said the book primarily concerned the jury system rather than an individual case, and that may well have been his intention but what makes the book so absorbing is the interweaving of the three threads. “It was a matter of damage control. It was not satisfactory but I was trying to make the unsatisfactoriness of it minimal” (Personal interview). Knox’s book was aimed at the legal profession, those who had served on juries and those who might serve on juries, which is most people but the last named group may well give little thought to the matter until they are called up. In other words, it was aimed at – and reached – a relatively small audience. Given that so little has been written about Australian juries outside academic publications, *Secrets of the Jury Room* still serves the journalistic purpose of reaching the broadest possible audience. Whether the uncertainty about the status of the case as represented in the book affected the size of the audience is difficult to say. It was an issue that may well not have worried those in the legal world who might have known the actual case or may have been less interested in the case details than the insights into the jury room. As a general reader, though, I was bothered by not knowing whether the details of the case were fact or fiction. After interviewing Knox I was able to enjoy the book more fully; other readers, of course, do not have that knowledge.

All six works examined in this chapter were either critically or commercially successful or made a significant impact on public debate and perceptions. Marr and Wilkinson may make their case too trenchantly for some readers but for most *Dark Victory* is by turns a thoroughly engrossing and deeply disturbing reading experience. In my view it is an impressive and enduring work. Simons managed a complicated set of ethical issues with firm sensitivity but was hampered by the need to write defensively. Garner is widely regarded as Australia's leading literary journalist (Ricketson "Helen Garner's *The First Stone*" 79-80), and *The First Stone* provoked probably the most passionate broad public reaction of the six works, but it is, as I have argued, a seriously flawed work of book-length journalism. Bryson, Blackburn and Knox's books were all, to a degree, hindered by the practitioners' inability to resolve ethical issues that arose for them, though each work has substantial merit and Bryson's remains a significant work. All six practitioners faced pressing ethical issues at various times or throughout the research and writing process, whether it was Bryson's use of an omniscient narrative voice and lack of transparency with readers, or Blackburn's inexpert use of interior monologue, or Simons' need to balance trusting source relationships with maintaining editorial independence even as she questioned that journalistic convention in her dealings with Ngarrindjeri women. Marr and Wilkinson balanced their desire to create a compelling narrative mode with the need to provide attribution of their sources, a need magnified by the politically charged material they dealt with. Legal restrictions forced Knox to overstate a disclaimer that left general readers uncertain how to read his book. And Garner struggled with ethical issues throughout, from her own sabotage of her attempts to interview the complainants, to the volatile affect on readers of her intensely intimate narrative voice, and the disastrous impact of splitting up Mead into six different people.

The six practitioners faced their ethical issues with differing degrees of success; some, like Blackburn, feel they resolved some issues when I argue she did not, while others, like Bryson, do not share my views about particular ethical practices. That is his prerogative, of course, as it is mine to question aspects of his practice. What became clear, though, in examining the ethical issues in individual works by the Australian practitioners is that they prompted a series of complex, interlocking questions. Is it possible to write in an omniscient narrative voice, as Bryson does, or

is omniscience incompatible with book-length journalism? Does it matter whether people read a work as fiction or non-fiction, as some did with *The First Stone*? When practitioners attempt to write interior monologue, as Blackburn does, to what extent is their success determined by the subject of the monologue and to what extent does it flow from the individual practitioner's writing ability? Should all practitioners include apparatus such as endnotes and notes to the reader in their works, as Marr and Wilkinson do, or is it only necessary for some works? When the need to represent complicated, contested events accurately in context clashes with the desire to create a compelling narrative mode, as it does for Simons, where and how does the practitioner find a balance between the two? Finally, to what extent do legal matters impinge on ethical issues of representation in book-length journalism, as Knox found in writing about the jury system?

All the practitioners were willing and engaged and thoughtful interviewees but there were gaps in their answers to the questions just asked, and others, about their practice. They lacked an overall framework in which to hold, articulate and mull over the ethical issues thrown up by the practice of book-length journalism. I could make judgements about the ethical decision-making in their works stemming from my experience as a practitioner and teacher of journalism but I, too, lacked a framework to locate and ground my analysis. The development of such a framework and testing it against the work of numerous practitioners is what occupies me in the next three chapters of this thesis.

CHAPTER FOUR: ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING IN RESEARCHING BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM

There must have been occasions when U2 regretted that I was around, but they never tried to get me to bury something. They took the best attitude anyone can take with a working writer: ‘I knew he was a scorpion when I put him on my back.’

Bill Flanagan (*U2 at the End of the World* 481)

The relative scarcity in the scholarly and professional literature on whether there are particular ethical issues arising in book-length journalism, and the experience of the Australian practitioners discussed in chapter three both point to the need to develop a specific framework to outline and explore the most pressing ethical issues in this field. Such a framework begins with the knowledge that just as ethical issues potentially arise throughout the production of daily journalism, so they can arise throughout the production of a work of book-length journalism. Some issues are common across newspaper, magazine and book-length journalism while some, I propose, arise in a particular form or are felt more urgently in the practice of book-length journalism. As there is already a substantial scholarly and professional literature about ethical issues arising in newspaper and magazine journalism, I am focusing on those that are distinctive to book-length journalism. To be specific, I devote considerable space in the next three chapters to discussing the work of Capote and Woodward but I focus on the particular issues arising from them practicing journalism at book-length. Ethical issues that could have arisen equally if they were writing daily journalism, such as whether Capote paid bribes to get access to the two convicted murderers in gaol (Clarke *Capote* 343) or whether Woodward and Bernstein flouted Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by trying to interview members of the Watergate Grand Jury, will not be considered here (*All the President's Men* 204-225; Christians et al *Media Ethics* 77-80).

The practitioner is the starting point and through-line for examining ethical issues in book-length journalism, as they generally initiate the idea for their book projects and along the way develop relationships with, and need to consider, the people they are writing about (the subjects of their books) and the people they are writing for (their readers). These two groups of people are important elements of the project but they only become part of it through their involvement with the practitioner, or what the practitioner produces. The first part of the tripartite framework I have developed concerns the ethical issues arising for practitioners when they are researching; the second part concerns ethical issues arising when practitioners are writing the work and the third part concerns how practitioners go about establishing a relationship with readers and, in turn, readers' expectations of book-length journalism.

A good deal of the work in producing book-length journalism sits in the research phase. I argue that central to assessing the success of a work of book-length journalism is appreciating how the journalist did their research. If the journalist has made significant factual errors or omitted relevant information or seriously misrepresented their subjects then their book's claims to veracity are undermined. In other words, the standards commonly applied to newspaper and magazine journalism extend to book-length projects. This does not mean two journalists working on the same topic will write identical books; as in daily journalism and in historical writing there is plenty of scope for conscientious and ethical practitioners to take differing approaches to research, to dig into the primary sources at different levels and to differ in their interpretations of documents, people and issues. But when a work of book-length journalism is about actual people and places and events and is presented as such then ethically, not to mention legally, it needs to be assessed in that domain. The means by which novelists gather material or draw on their imagination also shapes their writing. Researching the novelist's working methods and the interplay between the novelist's imagination and events or people in their life can tell us something about the creative process, but novels can be enjoyed by readers without knowing anything of that. This is not so in book-length journalism, which makes claims to veracity. Or, it may be possible to enjoy a work of book-length journalism without knowing about the research process that shaped the book, but to do that readers would either need to accept on trust the book's claims to veracity, or read the book as fiction or be unconcerned about the relationship between the two. A

practitioner of book-length journalism cannot control exactly how people will react to their work but practitioners can be held responsible for what they present readers and the terms in which they present it. The important question of how readers can assess works of book-length journalism when they know little or less about the events being described will be discussed in chapter six. Investigating the research phase of book-length journalism has potential to illuminate ethical issues usually not considered by literary studies scholars who tend to be more interested in the text than in how what is in the text came to be in it.

Practitioners working on book-length projects conduct their research by gathering and analysing documents, whether in print or online, by interviewing people and by observing events first-hand. The questions arising for practitioners as they research include: should some conventional practices of daily journalism, such as not paying sources for material (sometimes honoured in the breach, admittedly) and not showing them what has been written before publication be reconsidered in book-length journalism? Should practitioners of book-length journalism be less willing to grant sources anonymity? The time available to practitioners of book-length journalism to immerse themselves in the culture of those they are writing about offers the opportunity to become closer to sources than is customary in daily journalism and develop a trusting relationship that enables the practitioner to present such people, who I will call principal sources, not in snapshots but in a more developed portrait. To do this, the practitioner needs to gather material about the principal source's appearance, their dress and their habits. They will want to know how the source felt and how they responded in situations that are highly personal, or extreme, and that may have revealed them in a poor light. Practitioners will need to find a balance between maintaining their editorial independence and managing the hurt they may cause by writing honestly about their principal sources.

Before going any further, it should be emphasized that not all works of book-length journalism require practitioners to develop close relationships with their sources. Gladwell's *The Tipping Point*, for instance, revolves around the exploration of an idea rather than any particular person's experience. Even in works of book-length journalism that have principal sources, the practitioner will probably have interviewed numerous other sources briefly, or even at length, to obtain specific information. But where journalists do need a high degree of trust and cooperation

from their principal sources they encounter ethical issues rare in daily journalism where typically journalists' contact with their sources is either fleeting or takes place within a professional relationship whose terms are narrowly drawn. When daily journalists do develop long-term close relationships with sources, they generally continue to draw on their information for hard news reports rather than write about their sources in the narrative mode used in the majority of works of book-length journalism. Alternatively, in smaller community media outlets where close long-term relationships with sources are relatively common, journalists sometimes do not even write hard news reports that could negatively affect their sources because they will continue to come into contact with them. Practitioners of book-length journalism, then, may well have little choice but to face the ethics of the journalist-source relationship because they cannot avoid it by simply moving to their next assignment.

The most difficult issue perhaps for practitioners of book-length journalism, then, is how they negotiate and manage the fine and sometimes porous boundaries between professional and personal relationships inherent in becoming close to principal sources. As outlined in chapter one, Oakley and Cocking in *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles* offer a useful guide for doctors and lawyers to enact their professional roles ethically that could be extrapolated to the practice of book-length journalism but discussion of that needs to be set alongside understanding of how the focus of scholarly attention on the relationship between journalists and their sources was on daily journalism (Zelizer *Taking Journalism Seriously* 151-53) until a practitioner rather than a scholar, Janet Malcolm, wrote the now famous opening to a two-part article for *The New Yorker* published on 13 and 20 March 1989 and headlined "Reflections: The Journalist and the Murderer" (38-73 and 49-82). It was published in book form the following year and it is from this edition that quotations will be taken. Malcolm makes an important contribution to the literature about the journalist-source relationship, as I have argued elsewhere ("Reassessing Janet Malcolm's *The Journalist and the Murderer*"). Malcolm's opening has been described in a doctoral thesis about her work as "one of the most provocative in the history of American journalism" (Fakazis *Janet Malcolm* 93-94):

Every journalist who is not too stupid or too full of himself to notice what is going on knows that what he does is morally indefensible. He is a kind of confidence man, preying on people's vanity, ignorance, or

loneliness, gaining their trust and betraying them without remorse. Like the credulous widow who wakes up one day to find the charming young man and all her savings gone, so the consenting subject of a piece of nonfiction writing learns – when the article or book appears – *his* hard lesson. Journalists justify their treachery in various ways according to their temperaments. The more pompous talk about freedom of speech and ‘the public’s right to know;’ the least talented talk about Art; the seemliest murmur about earning a living (*The Journalist and the Murderer* 3).

Malcolm’s words created a furore among journalists. What about sources who tried to manipulate journalists, asked some? How could Malcolm condemn an entire profession on a single case, asked others? Why did she not mention a libel suit in which her own journalistic practice was being questioned? And, finally, why did she write with such infuriating certitude? (Gottlieb, “Dangerous Liaisons,” 21-35; Fakazis 94-113). Martin Gottlieb, writing in *Columbia Journalism Review*, the American news media industry’s leading trade publication, said the vehemence of many journalists’ responses suggests Malcolm had hit an exposed nerve (21). Elizabeth Fakazis, in her PhD about Malcolm’s libel suit, notes that there had been little media interest in the lawsuit until after “Reflections: The Journalist and the Murderer” was published in *The New Yorker* and then it was overwhelmingly negative (92). The journalists’ objections were not entirely misdirected, however. Taking them one by one: first, Malcolm does not ignore the role of sources. She understands how sources try to persuade journalists of the validity of their perspective (18, 143). She understands the still potent lure for sources of fame, or at least publicity (58). She also explores the source’s desperate need for what Malcolm refers to as their “story” to be found interesting by the journalist, which she compares to Scheherazade in *The Thousand and One Arabian Nights* (20). It is fair to say, though, that she underplays the source’s role and power in their relationship with journalists. Second, of course, journalism should not be condemned on the strength of one case study; nor should other groups in society, as journalists themselves might well remember before, to take one instance among many, welding the adjective “bungling” to the noun “bureaucrats” in newspaper headlines. Third, Malcolm did ignore in her article the lawsuit brought against her over an earlier article, headlined

“Annals of Scholarship: Trouble in the Archives” that appeared in *The New Yorker* on 5 and 12 December 1983. When “Reflections: The Journalist and the Murderer” was published in book form she defended her decision in an afterword (147-163) but her argument was almost as thin as the original article’s opening had been provocative. As one of her most perceptive, and otherwise admiring, critics, Craig Seligman, writes in *Salon*: “A more stupefying specimen of bullshit would be hard to find – though there’s also something reassuring, even endearing, in this demonstration that Malcolm can be just as neurotic and self-deceiving as the rest of us” (www.salon.com/people/bc/2000/02/29/malcolm/print.html). Finally, the elegantly stinging certitude that characterizes Malcolm’s prose points to a paradox in her work; namely that she articulates, even delights in, the ambiguities of issues in prose of ringing unambiguity.

The dual effect of Malcolm’s approach has been to substantially influence a debate – for better and for worse. Her insights were soon reflected in the academic literature, (Elliot and Culver “Defining and Analyzing Journalistic Deception;” Borden “Empathic Listening”), continue to be debated (Cowan “The Legal and Ethical Limits of Factual Misrepresentation;” Goldstein *Journalism and Truth* 141-60), and have been cited approvingly by Harr and Krakauer, two of Boynton’s interviewees (*The New New Journalism* 119-20, 166-67). The shortcoming is that Malcolm’s writing offers an insight into journalist-source relationships rather than a framework for analysing its range of characteristics in their complexity. What makes her work so relevant to this thesis is that the case central to *The Journalist and the Murderer* involved not a newspaper or magazine journalist but one working on book-length journalism, which means her insights, while relevant, apply less to daily journalism where, as Wendell Rawls Sr., a newspaper editorial executive, says practitioners rarely spend enough time with a source to develop an emotional relationship that might later feel like betrayal to the source (Gottlieb 26).

A fruitful place to consider a framework for analysing journalist-source relationships in book-length journalism can be found in anthropology, particularly ethnographic fieldwork, which is defined as “a thorough close-up study of a particular social and cultural environment, where the researcher is normally required to spend a year or more” (Eriksen *Small Places, Large Issues* 4). In anthropology, fieldworkers are known as guests while those they study are called hosts. Malcolm herself briefly

mentions anthropological fieldwork in her afterword but draws nothing from that discipline to ameliorate what for her is the “inescapably lopsided” relationship between journalists and their sources (161-62). It is an opportunity missed. Several of Boynton’s interviewees, such as Conover (4) and Langewiesche (207), have studied anthropology at university and found its methods valuable for their journalism. Other Boynton interviewees have come to anthropology through their partners (Kramer 204) or in the case of Dash, by being dubbed the “staff anthropologist” when working at *The Washington Post* (54). These practitioners note that concepts and practices in anthropological fieldwork have helped them when immersing themselves in the cultures of people they write about. Conover is probably the strongest advocate of taking an anthropological approach. He describes his year working as a guard at Sing Sing prison for his book *Newjack* as an exercise in participant observation, the term used in anthropology for fieldworkers living and taking part in the lives and activities of the group they are observing. “It was like what journalists do, only you stayed longer, got in deeper, and didn’t have to chase breaking news. There seemed to be more space for – and possibility of – insight and contemplation” (“Foreword” xi).

Thomas Eriksen writes in *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology* that there are many ways of conducting fieldwork and “it is impossible to provide a clear recipe for how to carry it out” at least in part because “the anthropologist him or herself is the most important ‘scientific instrument’ used” (26). Fieldwork is both demanding and rewarding “because the ethnographer invests not only professional skills in it, but also interpersonal skills. The ethnographer draws on his or her entire personality to a greater extent than any other scientist” (27). Ethnographers emerge from their fieldwork exhausted but with abundant material. The depth of personal investment in fieldwork raises important ethical issues, he writes, which requires a sifting and sorting through of the exact nature of the personal relationship and its duration; what happens, Eriksen asks, when the “close friends from abroad” eventually vanish, perhaps never to return? (28). He believes the value of participant observation lies “in the quality of the empirical data one has collected, not in the number of close friends one has acquired in the field” (27).

If Eriksen does not specify where relationships between fieldworkers and those they study sit along the continuum between professional and personal, it may be because the appropriate place will differ from one ethnographer to another and from group to another. Clifford Geertz has written that “If we want to discover what man amounts to, we can only find it in what men are: and what men are, above all other things, is various” (*The Interpretation of Cultures* 52). David Bromley and Lewis Carter, editors of a collection of anthropologists’ essays about their fieldwork among contemporary religious groups, argue that their contributors’ experiences went beyond guidance offered in textbooks in ways that even the contributors themselves had not anticipated (*Toward Reflexive Ethnography: Participating, Observing, Narrating* 2). Their collection was spurred by the realization that complex and demanding fieldwork experiences were common but rarely discussed in the discipline’s literature. The anthropologists contributing to *Toward Reflexive Ethnography* found themselves struggling with issues that could not be resolved simply by ensuring they did no harm to those they studied. One, James Chancellor, gained access to a group known as The Family (previously called the Children of God) partly by chance and partly because he developed a complex relationship with members of the group based on trust, his evangelical Christian faith, his openness and their desire to get a full account of their beliefs into the wider world (“The Family and the Truth?” 37-42). At the time The Family was the subject of intense scrutiny by government agencies over its former extreme sexual practices that included sexual abuse of children and an activity known as ‘flirty fishing’ where Family members used sex as a way of recruiting new members. As he gained the trust of The Family’s leadership, Chancellor was given virtually unlimited access to The Family’s records and conducted more than two hundred in-depth interviews with members. He found the Family had become a “far more democratic, kinder, and gentler organization” since the death in 1994 of its leader, David Berg (45). He tried to find a balance between recording the deplorable, even criminal, elements of the movement’s history and maintaining the relationships he had already forged. He included material that the Family’s current leader would have preferred was excluded but he also minimized those aspects of Berg’s character that “any outsider might well see as profoundly disturbing, if not evil” (50).

Another scholar recounting her experience, Amy Siskind, opted to give up access to her religious group to be free to criticize what she believed were its repressive practices that interfered with members' marital lives and parenting. Siskind had been raised in the group – the Sullivan Institute/Fourth Wall Community – but eventually left it even though she had been deeply invested in it. The Sullivanians were a Marxist-oriented group that had formed as a therapeutic community in New York with the aim of helping people radically change their personalities to transform their own lives and eventually those of other people. Once Siskind left the community she could not gain access to it as a researcher (“Telling Tales, Naming Names” 181-96). Where Chancellor and Siskind's experiences exemplify the delicacy of negotiating a trusting guest/host relationship with writing reports critical of their practices, Kenneth Liberman boldly opens up the topic of the impact fieldwork may have on the anthropologist by turning on its head the conventional cautionary tales in anthropological literature about “going native” (“Ethnographic Practice and the Critical Spirit” 93-116). Instead of asking how fieldworkers could have allowed themselves to be so affected by those they are studying, Liberman's question is: how could they not? “How can I discover anything meaningfully accurate about the people I am living with if I refuse to make myself open to being transformed by them?” (95)

These essays and others in *Toward Reflexive Ethnography* are vibrant examples of practitioners reflecting on their work and placing their reflections in the context of their discipline's literature. They underscore the value of such activity and are directly relevant to the practice of book-length journalism. Both Chancellor and Siskind's struggles to balance the level of access they had to the communities studied with the freedom to write what they found are struggles familiar to both the Australian practitioners interviewed for this thesis and to Boynton's interviewees. The issue of the potentially transformative impact of fieldwork on fieldworkers that Liberman raises is not a familiar debate in a practice whose history and culture emphasizes the role of observer, but it is an issue discussed by some Australian practitioners in interviews for this thesis (Simons and Hooper) and by some of Boynton's interviewees, notably Conover (18-19), Dash (65), Kotlowitz (137-38) and LeBlanc (245-46).

The question of what anthropology might offer journalism has been discussed in the journalism studies literature (Kennamer “What Journalists and Researchers have in

Common About Ethics” 77-89; Bird “The Journalist as Ethnographer” 301-308), but perhaps the most valuable contribution has been by Stephen Bates, the title of whose article raises a very real question: “Who is the Journalist’s Client?” Most professions, such as those analysed by Oakley and Cocking, medicine and law, owe a duty of loyalty to their client and those that do not have a direct client, such as historians and other scholars, have developed codes of ethics (3). Bates argues that the uncertain professional status of journalism means practitioners do not have a primary client. They must be loyal to employers but employers may ask, even require them to behave unethically; they must protect the identity of sources where asked, but that may be overridden by their obligation to their readers; they write for their readers but sometimes journalists decide to give readers not what they want but what the journalist believes readers need to know. The journalist, according to Bates, has several clients, none of whom has an absolute claim on them. (3, 14-16). This patchwork of often competing claims is one key reason journalistic practice throws up such complex ethical issues. For Bates, the absence of a clearly defined client can be overcome by the accountability to peers that is provided by the community of journalists disclosing and writing about ethical failings in their own industry, such as the infamous faked stories about an eight year old heroin addict that cost Janet Cooke her job and her then metropolitan editor Bob Woodward a chance of becoming editor of *The Washington Post* (15). Bates is primarily concerned with daily journalism but his ideas can be extended to book-length journalism where they invite reconsideration of whether a community of peers operates in the book world and whether the practitioner has the same kind of relationship with a publishing house that they have with a newspaper or magazine company.

The journalist’s client may remain fluid, but the American Anthropological Association code of ethics, last updated in 1998, says anthropological researchers have primary ethical obligations to the people they study and these obligations “can supersede the goal of seeking new knowledge, and can lead to decisions not to undertake or to discontinue a research project when the primary obligation conflicts with other responsibilities.” The code specifies that anthropologists “must do everything in their power to ensure that their research does not harm the safety, dignity, or privacy of the people with whom they work”. Fieldworker guests need to obtain the informed consent of their hosts before the research begins, including

making hosts aware of the potential implications and impact of the research on their lives.” Further, it is “understood the informed consent process is dynamic and continuous.” It is the hosts’ choice whether they wish to remain anonymous. (<http://dev.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm> 1-8).

For journalists working in the daily news media this code is less than practical; interviewees need to be publicly identified wherever possible; Chancellor, for instance, agreed to withhold the Family members’ names in his book even though the group had been the subject of intense media scrutiny and past members had published their memoirs (“The Family and the Truth?” 41-43). The prospect, too, of gaining informed consent from a stonewalling president or prime minister is risible. For a practitioner immersing themselves in a particular culture for a work of book-length journalism, though, the question of informed consent is relevant and helpful. The value of the AAA’s code is the weight it puts on the responsibilities of the journalist toward the rights of the people they write about, a point endorsed by Walt Harrington, author of several works of book-length journalism and head of the University of Illinois’s Journalism department (“A Writer’s Essay” *Intimate Journalism* xxiv). It prods them to ask whether they do need to give more consideration to their principal source’s wellbeing rather than treat them as simply as a conduit for information, as the word source connotes, and, second, whether to shed their status as observers and acknowledge a deeper level of engagement in the lives of their principal sources. Even so, the two sets of codes have differing emphases. In the AAA code the researcher’s responsibility to their hosts is placed before their responsibility to scholarship and science, whereas in the SPJ code, seeking truth and reporting it is placed before minimizing harm. In the “safari-scholar” era “data-mining” of various remote communities was a feature of anthropology but since the 1950s and the end of colonialism many of those being studied have voiced their objections to paternalistic attitudes and approaches by western scholars (Trimble and Fisher xvii; Eriksen 18). The dissolving of these attitudes has been reflected in the AAA’s code of ethics.

Conversely, the goal of journalists is to find out what is happening in the world even or especially if those in positions of power and authority try to stop them, and report their findings to the broadest possible audience. Journalists are notorious for romanticizing the nobility of their calling, but the outstanding journalism listed in the

appendices to this thesis and in anthologies such as *Shaking the Foundations: 200 Years of Investigative Journalism in America* underscore the value to society of journalistic disclosure. There remains, though, an inherent tension between the goals of maximizing disclosure and minimizing harm, or, the virtues of social justice by providing people with information to fulfil their role as citizens on the one hand and benevolence towards people on the other. Practitioners of book-length journalism may not want to go as far as abandoning a project for any person involved in it who expresses distress, but the AAA code and the ethnographers' experiences provide a valuable alternative professional practice culture against which to discuss the ethical issues arising in the research phase of book-length journalism. The fluid nature of just who is the journalist's client makes more necessary Oakley and Cocking's matching of virtue ethics to professional roles because it magnifies the need to correlate particular virtues to the particular roles and relationships that practitioners of book-length journalism create with their principal sources.

Specifically, I will do this by analysing three prominent case studies concerning the work of Malcolm, Capote and Woodward, and by drawing on the reflections of leading practitioners, particularly those interviewed by Boynton. Malcolm's *The Journalist and the Murderer* has been discussed so far in this chapter as a piece of media criticism about the journalist-source relationship as manifested in book-length journalism but it is also itself a work of book-length journalism and requires discussion on those terms. It focuses on just one case, which originated in an approach to Malcolm by a legal team representing another journalist, Joe McGinniss, who was being sued by a convicted murderer, Jeffrey MacDonald, over his work of book-length journalism entitled *Fatal Vision*. Published in 1983, *Fatal Vision* is about MacDonald's conviction for murdering his pregnant wife and two young children. McGinniss's lawyers believed the lawsuit represented a threat to the protection afforded writers under the first amendment of the American constitution (Malcolm 6-7; Kornstein *Twisted Vision* 127-29). MacDonald was not suing for defamation but for breach of contract by McGinniss. MacDonald and his legal team had originally approached McGinniss to write about his murder trial, offering unfettered access to MacDonald and the legal team's strategy in exchange for more than a quarter of the US\$300,000 advance and one third of any royalties from the

book that McGinniss would write about the case (Malcolm 19; McGinniss “The 1989 Epilogue” 665).

McGinniss agreed, but during the trial began doubting the innocence of his principal source. He did not share these doubts with MacDonald or his legal team (Malcolm 24). By the end he agreed with the jury that MacDonald had murdered his family. He did not tell MacDonald his view. He had already developed a close relationship with McDonald before the trial, staying at his home with him, drinking beer, watching sport on television, jogging together and “classifying women according to looks” as Malcolm puts it (22), but he still needed to gather information about MacDonald’s childhood, his marriage and military career. He was not allowed to interview MacDonald in prison so he gathered it primarily by correspondence. The prisoner wanted to see the manuscript but McGinniss refused on the ground that he needed to retain editorial independence. It was only when *Fatal Vision* was published that MacDonald learnt unequivocally of McGinniss’s change of mind. MacDonald sued, citing a clause in their agreement exempting the journalist from libel claims “providing that the essential integrity of my life story is maintained” (Malcolm 21). The breach of contract case was heard in 1987 before a judge and jury. What intrigued Malcolm was that, by her account, “five of the six jurors were persuaded that a man who was serving three consecutive life sentences for the murder of his wife and two small children was deserving of more sympathy than the writer who had deceived him” (6). I say by her account because her statement was contested by McGinniss, a point to which I will return. Malcolm quoted extensively from a series of around forty of McGinniss’ letters to MacDonald in jail and from his cross-examination at the trial as they showed in great detail the rarely exposed underbelly of journalistic practice. In his first letter McGinniss sympathizes that anyone could see MacDonald had not received a fair trial, and laments:

Goddamn, Jeff, one of the worst things about all this is how suddenly and totally all your friends – self included – have been deprived of the pleasure of your company. What the fuck were those people thinking of? How could 12 people not only agree to believe such a horrendous proposition, but agree, with a man’s life at stake, that they believed it beyond a reasonable doubt? In six and a half hours? (Malcolm 36).

If McGinniss often presented himself to MacDonald as a friend, he later told Malcolm that the former Army doctor was clearly trying to manipulate him and that he had been aware of this from the outset. “But did I have an obligation to say, ‘Wait a minute. I think you are manipulating me, and I have to call your attention to the fact that I’m aware of this, just so you’ll understand you are not succeeding?’” (17). He acknowledged to another journalist who had covered the murder trial that he felt “terribly conflicted”. He had come to like MacDonald but “how can you like a guy who has killed his wife and kids?” (24). In response to the *Newsday* journalist’s question that he had betrayed MacDonald, McGinniss said: “My only obligation from the beginning was to the truth” (25). McGinniss was arguing, then, that the ends justified the means, a position derived from utilitarianism. MacDonald’s lawyer, Gary Bostwick, however, swooped on the switch in McGinniss’s behavior. To some, it may appear axiomatic that a journalist is not a friend, but Malcolm interviewed four of the six jurors in the case, reporting them worried by the slippage between friendship and journalism. One tells her:

‘The part I didn’t like was when MacDonald let McGinniss use his condominium, and McGinniss took it upon himself to find the motive for the murders,’ she said. ‘I didn’t like the fact that McGinniss tried to find a motive for a book that was a best-seller, and that’s *all* he was concerned about’ (44).

Well known writers such as William F. Buckley Jr. and Joseph Wambaugh testified in support of McGinniss’ practices, but they did not fare well under Bostwick’s cross-examination (50-55). In his closing argument, Bostwick said that the practitioners’ argument that they would do whatever was necessary to write their book was one that had been used by demagogues and dictators throughout history to justify their actions (56).

Journalists’ ruthlessness in pursuing news is hardly news: it has been portrayed negatively in films at least as far back as 1951 when in *Ace in the Hole*, a newspaper reporter played by Kirk Douglas delayed the rescue of a man at a cave-in until he could organize exclusive coverage of the disaster (Ehrlich *Journalism in the Movies* 82-86). What made Malcolm’s work of media criticism “newsworthy” was that she put under a microscope an aspect of journalist-source relationships hitherto rarely

discussed. Journalists in newspapers and magazines sometimes present a friendly face to sources before attacking them in print but the process is quicker, cruder and less ethically complex than in book-length journalism where practitioners must go beyond a dazzling smile and develop a deeper level of trust with principal sources. The evidence suggests MacDonald was manipulative and deceitful but so too was McGinniss in lying about his belief that MacDonald was guilty after sending him letters giving the opposite impression and after apparently befriending MacDonald. The publishing contract protected McGinniss's editorial independence (Kornstein "Twisted Vision" 131, 133-36) but once McGinniss agreed to share his book earnings with MacDonald he had, in effect, signed a Faustian pact. He surely knew it was always possible the charge would be upheld in court; when that eventuated McGinniss had to share his royalties with a convicted triple murderer. McGinniss' editorial independence was crippled by the financial agreement he had with his principal source. If a news organization had paid MacDonald for an interview it would have been seen as chequebook journalism. McGinniss could perhaps have mitigated his problem by disclosing the agreement, but he did not mention it in *Fatal Vision* when recounting how he came to write the book (3-7), nor in an afterword written two years after publication, by which time MacDonald had sued (654-59). The financial agreement drew the ire of respected practitioners of book-length journalism such as David Halberstam and even one who had testified on McGinniss' behalf (Gottlieb "Dangerous Liaisons" 25, 31).

Where McGinniss had few defenders for the financial agreement, the questions of when practitioners might be justified in deceiving their principal sources and the fine line between trust and friendship are murkier and Malcolm made a significant contribution to exposing and exploring these issues. Such is the persuasive power of her book-length journalism, however, that it almost obscures from view the more conventional interpretation of the MacDonald-McGinniss dispute, namely that MacDonald tried to use McGinniss to push his claims of innocence and when McGinniss reached the opposite conclusion, MacDonald sought to punish him. Few journalists of more than a few years standing in the industry would not have experienced the wrath of a source about whom they had written an unfavorable article. Imagine instead the case not through the prism of the deceitful journalist but through that of the murderer. Leaving aside whether MacDonald is a murderer or has

been wrongly convicted, what kind of good faith did he show by agreeing to cooperate fully with McGinniss only as long as McGinniss portrayed him in a way that met MacDonald's approval? At a pre-trial hearing for the civil suit, federal magistrate James McMahan said MacDonald wanted the services of a "kept journalist," or a "PR man" (McGinniss "The 1989 Epilogue" 675). At the trial, MacDonald admitted that despite his contract he would have ceased cooperating with McGinniss if he had learnt unequivocally the writer believed him guilty. (Kornstein "Twisted Vision" 145). Malcolm's skill as a writer means she supplants the standard reading of the McGinniss-MacDonald case that would draw on the long history of valiant struggles for freedom of the press. The term Watergate is today shorthand for just such a masterplot (Abbott *Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* 46-49). Drawing on the framework provided by Jack Lule in his study of the relationship between journalism and mythology, *Daily News, Eternal Stories*, the standard reading sees McGinniss the journalist as David and MacDonald the murderer as Goliath but Malcolm makes the murderer David and the journalist Goliath.

Malcolm distorts the MacDonald-McGinniss lawsuit by pushing out of view the standard reading of the case. First, as mentioned earlier, one of Malcolm's most potent assertions is that at the civil trial five of the six jurors were more sympathetic to the murderer than the journalist. McGinniss and his lawyer, Daniel Kornstein, both argue this seriously misrepresents the trial, which they emphasise Malcolm did not attend. To reach their decision, the jurors were instructed by the judge to answer thirty-six questions about issues heard in the trial. They needed to reach unanimous agreement on a question before moving to the next one. The first question concerned not McGinniss but MacDonald. It asked whether the convicted murderer "had performed all of the obligations and conditions on him under the contract." One juror found MacDonald had broken his contract; others were unsure and confused about a "thicket of legalities" (Kornstein "Twisted Vision" 132). The jury was deadlocked and the judge had to declare a mistrial. None of the other questions, which, among other things, went to McGinniss's behaviour toward MacDonald, was voted on by the jury. The jury forewoman was quoted in the news media saying that despite widespread assumptions that the jury sympathized with MacDonald and "were going to give him the Earth," that was not so. She would have welcomed the opportunity to say that "MacDonald got what he asked for and McGinniss did what he said he'd do"

(Kornstein “Twisted Vision” 132-33). One media outlet quoted several jurors saying they would not have awarded damages against the journalist and another, in its report of the trial, printed a photograph of McGinniss accompanied by the caption: “Writer Wins Court Victory” (Kornstein 133). If McGinniss and Kornstein themselves have distorted the evidence, Malcolm, to my knowledge, has not responded to their arguments.

Second, by underplaying the extent to which sources may be able, not to mention willing, to manipulate journalists, Malcolm mischaracterizes MacDonald. She marvels that despite all the problems MacDonald had with McGinniss, he was happy to talk to her and to other journalists and draws an analogy with psychoanalysis where the patient regresses in their relationship with the therapist (Malcolm 32). There is something to be said for this idea but an alternative explanation has equal force. MacDonald has been sitting in jail convicted of murder. He believes he is innocent and is desperate to find someone to write his version of events and help win him a new trial. He has only one card in his hand – access to him – and he plays it to maximum effect. Third, Malcolm characterizes the journalist-source relationship in one way – seduction followed by betrayal – and aims to avoid such behaviour in her own practice, putting the needs of her “text” ahead of the “feelings” of her sources (163), but she also writes that McGinniss’s decision to stop being interviewed by her freed her from any “guilt” she might have felt in portraying him harshly (95). This is tantamount to saying there are only two possible ways practitioners can engage with their principal sources: seduce, then betray them, or stay clear so that you can treat people as “characters” (159) in a “text” rather than autonomous human beings. Malcolm rightly excoriates McGinniss for deceiving MacDonald but her own practice does not envisage the possibility of practitioners openly disagreeing with principal sources, and continuing to work with them. After all the intelligence and courage Malcolm shows in opening up the journalist-source relationship in book-length journalism, she closes it down by writing, in a paragraph added to the original article when *The Journalist and the Murderer* was published in book form, that “nothing can be done” about the falseness built into the journalist-source relationship (142) and in the afterword describing it as “the canker that lies at the heart of the rose of journalism” (158). This is a pity, because not only is Malcolm an acutely perceptive critic and superb prose stylist, but the affect of her brilliant but narrow

framing of the journalist-source relationship is to provoke strong agreement or disagreement, leaving little space for other ways to think about it.

A case that in many ways is a more striking and more resonant example of the difficulties thrown up by the journalist-source relationship is Capote's *In Cold Blood*, which was first published over four consecutive weekly issues of *The New Yorker* from 25 September 1965 and released in book form the following January (Clarke *Too Brief a Treat* 467; De Bellis "Visions and Revisions" 519). In recent years two films have been made about the ethical issues Capote faced, and in some ways courted, in creating *In Cold Blood*. Dan Futterman, screenwriter of *Capote*, has said Malcolm's book was his initial impetus ("*Capote*": *The Shooting Script* 111-12). In the research phase of *In Cold Blood*, the main ethical issues that arise are: whether Capote saw his primary obligation to his artistic ambition or to his principal sources; and the dilemma he faced when he became very close to one of the convicted murderers he was writing about. By the end of the 1950s Capote was a well regarded novelist best known for *Breakfast at Tiffany's* who had also written some journalism, notably an extraordinarily intimate profile of actor Marlon Brando, "The Duke in his Domain." (*A Capote Reader* 517-44). He believed journalism was "the most underestimated, the least explored of literary mediums" (Plimpton "The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel" 47) and he aimed to create a work of art by reporting actual events in what he termed in an interview a "Nonfiction Novel." (The American spelling is "nonfiction" but on the dust-jacket of the first hardback edition it is spelt "Non-fiction." The word falls on a line break, so it is not clear how Capote intended it to be spelt). When he read a news article published on 16 November 1959 in *The New York Times* about the murder of four members of a farming family in Kansas, the Clutters, he immediately felt the event offered an opportunity to create such a work (Plimpton 50-51).

From the beginning, then, Capote saw the murder of four innocent people as an opportunity to make a reputation for himself as a major artist; when he told the detective in charge of the investigation, Alvin Dewey, that he had little interest in whether the crime was solved, Dewey rebuked him (Clarke *Capote* 321). It took time, payment to some interviewees, the calm manner of his childhood friend, author and research assistant, Nelle Harper Lee, and persistence for Capote to gain the trust of people he wanted to interview but eventually he developed a close relationship

with both Dewey and the two convicted murderers, Dick Hickock and, especially, Perry Smith (Clarke *Capote* 321-24; Shields *Mockingbird* 140-41). From Dewey he gained an extraordinary level of access to key documents, to the murderers' signed confessions, to an insight into how the investigation was conducted and was able to check countless details with him over the years Capote took to write *In Cold Blood* (Clarke *Too Brief a Treat* 273-367). Dewey even provided stage directions for the transcripts of the police interviews: when the detectives confronted Smith with their belief he had been at the Clutter farmhouse the night they were killed there was "a full minute of silence. Perry turns white. Looked at the ceiling. Swallows" (New York Public Library Capote papers Box 7, Folder 9). Capote became close to Dewey, and his wife and children; there are more letters to the Deweys in *Too Brief a Treat* than to anyone else, many of which testify to how fond Capote was of the Deweys and they of him to the point where they holidayed together in 1963 and the following year Capote took them to Beverley Hills to socialize with a raft of his actor friends, including Frank Sinatra, Jack Lemmon, Natalie Wood and producer David Selznick (New York Public Library Capote papers, Box 23, Folders 7 and 11) From Smith and Hickock he gained not only their accounts of what they did at the Clutter family's farm house, but the full background of their lives and the period they were on the run after committing the murders (Clarke *Capote* 343-44). What makes the creation of *In Cold Blood* such a compelling example is the length of time between Smith and Hickock's conviction – 29 March 1960 – and the eventual date of their execution after numerous appeals and stays – 14 April 1965 (Clarke *Too Brief a Treat* 466-67). Capote was forced again and again to choose between his allegiance to his project and to his principal sources; his obligations to his readers appeared to be swallowed by his ambitions for the book, on the ground that whatever was good for his book would be good for his readers too.

Capote's dilemma is captured in the many letters he sent and received from his principal sources and his friends, which were published in 2004 by his biographer, Gerald Clarke, but so far appear to have escaped scholars' attention. Capote conducted his primary research in Kansas over a month between 16 December 1959 and 20 January 1960 and then when he returned for the trial in March 1960 (Clarke *Capote* 320; Clarke *Too Brief a Treat* 276; Shields *Mockingbird* 176). Between then and 1963 he lived overseas and worked on his manuscript before returning to the

United States to finish writing it, which he did in February 1965. As early as April 1961 he told Dewey in a letter that he could not finish the book until he knew how the matter ended (Clarke *Too Brief a Treat*, 314). In November the same year he was told by the editor of *The New Yorker*, William Shawn, who had read sixty thousand words of the manuscript that it was “much the best work” he had done (*Too Brief a Treat* 328). By the time Capote had finished the third of the book’s projected four parts, Shawn was describing it to him in a telegram as a masterpiece and a “work of art people will be reading two hundred years from today” (382). Capote knew, then, that he had every chance of realizing his artistic ambition but that it would be achieved at the expense of a further two lives, those of Hickock and Smith. There was little doubt that the two men had committed murder in cold blood as the book’s title suggests. It is possible to read a second meaning into the title, namely that capital punishment is also a cold-blooded killing but Capote’s letters reveal that he was less concerned about the morality of capital punishment than with how the seemingly endless opportunities for appeals and stays of execution made justice a cruelly slow business, for those convicted as well as for the victims’ surviving family members (386, 415). But the party he seemed most concerned about was himself.

There are at least fifteen letters in *Too Brief a Treat* and several more in the Capote papers held by the New York Public Library that Clarke did not select in which Capote laments the delay in carrying out the executions, beginning with one he sent to Dewey in February 1961: “Am most anxious to hear at once the outcome of D.H [Dick Hickock] and P.S [Perry Smith] appeal” (Underline in original Box 23, Folder 4; other similar letters in Folders 8 and 12). In September 1962 he was sarcastic about the setting of a date for the execution. “Will H & S [Hickock and Smith] live to a ripe and happy old age? – or will they swing and make a lot of other folks very happy indeed? For the answer to these and other suspenseful questions tune in tomorrow to your favorite radio program, ‘Western Justice’, sponsored by the Slow Motion Molasses Company, a Kansas Product” (*Too Brief a Treat* 363). By 1964 after more delays Capote was exasperated, telling Dewey “My God! Why don’t they just turn them loose and be done with it?” (391). Early the following year when yet another execution date was set, Capote told a friend “Now let’s keep everything crossed – knees, eyes, hands, fingers!” (Underline in original 412) but when that date, too, was postponed, he told another friend “I hardly give a fuck anymore what

happens. My sanity is at stake” (Underline in original 413). Sandwiched between these last two letters is one he sent to Perry Smith: “I’ve only just heard about the court’s denial. I’m very sorry about it. But remember, this isn’t the first setback” (412). It is clear from Capote’s letters and from Clarke’s comprehensive biography published in 1988 that he enacted Malcolm’s pattern of seduction and betrayal by appealing to Smith’s own unrealized artistic ambition through name-dropping of Hollywood stars he knew such as Humphrey Bogart and discussing art and literature with him to persuade Smith to reveal all he could (Capote papers, Box 11, Folder 1). As the years dragged on Smith and Hickock continually asked Capote how they would be portrayed in his book but Capote “danced round the subject, pretending, until the day they were executed, that he was barely half-done and, in fact, might never finish” (Clarke *Capote* 346). When they independently discovered the title, Capote lied, telling them they were wrong even though he had known what it would be since June 1960 just three months after Smith and Hickock were convicted (Clarke *Capote* 346; Clarke *Too Brief A Treat* 287).

While it needs to be kept in mind that Capote was dealing with two convicted murderers, their crimes did not exonerate him from all care toward them. And it is clear from Capote’s letters and the biographies by Clarke and a 1998 oral biography edited by George Plimpton that Capote was deeply torn. His ambition for his project impelled him to manipulate Smith but he also became close to him and did care for him. A number of his friends noticed that Capote was obsessed with Smith (Plimpton *Truman Capote* 215) and he himself in several letters wrote about how difficult he found composing the book because he was “too emotionally involved with the material” (*Too Brief a Treat* 303). In one letter he describes himself, without any apparent irony, as “imprisoned by *In Cold Blood*” (350). When Capote had first arrived in Kansas his assignment for *The New Yorker* was to portray the impact on a small rural community of the multiple murders but that altered when Capote saw Smith and Hickock sitting in court for the arraignment. “Look, his feet don’t touch the floor,” he told Harper Lee. “Oh, oh! This is the beginning of a great love affair,” she recalled to Clarke (*Capote* 326). Each man looked at the other and saw what he could have been. Both were short and physically odd; a motorcycle accident had left Smith with a limp and Capote had a voice so high only a dog could hear it, as it was uncharitably remarked in New York literary circles (Clarke *Capote* 73), and even in

conservative postwar America Capote never hid his homosexuality. Both had been abandoned as children and their mothers were alcoholics (Ricketson “The Capote Conundrum”). It was as if the two of them grew up in the same house and that where Capote had left by the front door, Smith had taken the back, as Philip Seymour Hoffman said in his role as Capote in the eponymous 2006 film (Futterman “*Capote*”: *The Shooting Script* 69).

In his letters to Smith, Capote’s tone was generally formal whereas his letters to friends were colloquial and often gossipy; when Smith asked him whether he was homosexual, though, Capote said he was (*Too Brief a Treat* 389-90). One detective in the Clutter case, Harold Nye, went so far as to say the two men became lovers while Smith was in jail (Plimpton *Truman Capote* 188-89) Sex between a journalist and their principal source is clearly outside the American and Australian codes of ethics but Nye’s unsubstantiated claim is flatly denied by Clarke who spent thirteen years researching and writing his Capote biography. “Harold Nye hated Truman and he would say anything to denigrate him. I could give you several reasons why they *couldn’t* have had sex on death row, but it would require a longer explanation than I can give now” (Italics in original; email interview). What transpired between Capote and Smith during his years in prison may never be known; what is clear is that Capote crossed the boundary outlined by Oakley and Cocking between developing a trusting professional relationship with a principal source and becoming psychologically enmeshed with him “*qua friend*” (*Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles* 99) to the point where it appears to have substantially affected his representation of Smith and the overall case, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Where the main ethical issue in Capote’s research originates in his artistic ambition, the main issues in Woodward’s research are that he extends a method used in his newspaper reporting – anonymous sourcing – and he relies heavily on other people’s accounts of events and meetings he did not witness for himself. Woodward uses the time granted him in writing a book for some research methods, such as gathering many documents, whether minutes of meetings, participants’ private diaries or classified government documents, but not for developing a close relationship with principal sources or for first-hand observation, which is rarely open to him because the subject of most of his sixteen books is what happens behind the closed doors of government. His most famous anonymous source went by a pseudonym, “Deep

Throat.” Originally referred to in the newsroom by Woodward as “My friend” and named after an infamous pornographic movie showing at the time, Deep Throat’s existence only became public when the two journalists wrote their book about how they reported the cover-up of the administration’s involvement in the Watergate break-in, *All the President’s Men*. Enormous mystique grew up around Deep Throat because of the importance of his information, because of Robert Redford’s film adaptation of the book and because Woodward refused steadfastly to divulge the identity of his source. Deep Throat remained anonymous despite the best efforts of numerous journalists and scholars (Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 101-13, 249-66) until 2005 when Deep Throat outed himself, not via Woodward and *The Washington Post*, but through his family’s lawyer in an article for *Vanity Fair* magazine. (O’Connor, “I’m The Guy They Called Deep Throat” 84-87, 127-31). He was W. Mark Felt, deputy head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the Watergate period. Scooped but not outdone, Woodward soon released a book entitled *The Secret Man* about his relationship with Felt.

Woodward recounts how he first met Felt by chance, in 1970, at the West Wing of the White House when he was a navy lieutenant and Felt was an assistant director in the FBI. Woodward was anxious and unhappy in his job while Felt was brimful of confidence and authority. Felt and Woodward’s father were the same age, and Woodward looked to Felt as a mentor, almost a surrogate father figure in fact (21). What emerges in reading *The Secret Man* and in Felt’s memoir reissued and expanded after his identity as Deep Throat was made public is not how close the two men were during Watergate but how little Woodward knew about Felt (*A G-Man’s Life* 199-226). Some distance can be attributed to the difference in age and status, to Felt’s general distrust of journalists and to his enjoyment of intrigue, but the two men placed great trust in each other and the stakes could hardly have been higher. The basis of their relationship, Woodward, writes, was that “He knew and I didn’t. I would flounder, fall dangerously off course, and he would right the ship of knowledge” (111). After Nixon resigned as president in 1974, Woodward and Felt had little to do with each other; Woodward was unable to learn how Felt saw their role in Watergate. In 2000 Woodward tried to re-establish his relationship with Felt who was by this time frail and forgetful. Woodward believed Felt’s role in bringing to light political corruption was honourable and should be recorded for posterity. He

describes an occasion when Felt's daughter Joan drove him and Felt to a restaurant near Felt's home. As Felt's memory of the Watergate days fades in and out like an errant radio signal, Woodward oscillates between frustration and elation. When, for a moment, Felt remembers forming "a very favorable impression of Bob Woodward and his work at the *Post*," Woodward starts bouncing with joy. "I wanted to jump in the front seat and hug him" (169). The scene reverberates with Woodward's yearning for the older man's approval for his early work but what is clear from *The Secret Man* is that despite the intensity of their encounters during Watergate, Woodward and Felt's relationship remained bounded by the exchange of information that propels daily journalism.

Woodward has strategically used the aura surrounding his relationship with Deep Throat to gain access to powerful people in government, the military and intelligence agencies.

I would even say at times that this was a 'Deep Throat' conversation, and some of those in the most sensitive positions or best-placed crossroads of the American government would nod and then talk in remarkable detail, plowing through security classifications and other barriers as if they did not exist, including private conversations with a president (184).

There is continuing debate within the academic and professional literature about the worth and the difficulties of anonymous sources (Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 107-119; Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 101-13, Chadwick *Sources and Conflicts*). The problem was well summarized by Hugh Culbertson: "The unnamed news source has been called a safety valve for democracy and a refuge for conscience, but also a crutch for lazy, careless reporters" (Christians et al *Media Ethics* 72). In the case of Woodward few deny that his use of anonymous sources has enabled him to make important journalistic disclosures. What concerns scholars and other practitioners is the absence of public accountability for Woodward's anonymous sources, and the high degree of trust he asks of readers. The paradox is that Woodward has built his career on the premise that everyone has secrets and when those in positions of power and authority ask us to trust them, we should be sceptical because almost invariably they are hiding something. By Woodward's own reasoning, then, why should we

trust him, a powerful, wealthy senior journalist whose books have made him a “human brand” as one of his biographers puts it? (Shepard 227) A journalist and experienced writer on media issues, Alicia Shepard is the first scholar to work through Woodward and Bernstein’s Watergate papers held at the University of Texas. She concludes that for Woodward anonymous sources are not the crutch of a lazy reporter. “The holy grail of his critics is to find that one important piece of information that he got wrong, to bring the whole mammoth Woodward oeuvre into question. Yet ever since he wrongly reported that [Hugh] Sloan had named [H.R. ‘Bob’] Haldeman before the [Watergate] grand jury, he’s managed never to make a serious mistake again” (*Woodward and Bernstein* 228).

Woodward defends his use of anonymous sources on the ground that it has enabled him to publish information that otherwise would have been kept hidden for 50 years, and that he fills a gap between daily journalism and history. Several practitioners question this approach, including Weinberg, a fellow investigative journalist and a former director of the organization Investigative Reporters and Editors. In an article written in 1992 he points to several journalists who have made important disclosures and quoted sources on the record, as Seymour Hersh did with Ari Ben-Menashe for his book *The Samson Option: Israel’s Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy*, or made valuable use of documentary evidence, as James Bamford did in writing about the secretive National Security Agency in *The Puzzle Palace*. Interviewed by Weinberg, Woodward said a careful examination of such books would show the most revelatory passages were based on anonymous sources but when Weinberg did so he found Woodward’s generalization unjustified (“The Secret Sharer” 52-59). In a more recent article on book-length journalism about the war in Iraq, Weinberg found several more examples of important disclosures in books that rely far less on anonymous sources than does Woodward (“The Book as an Investigative Vehicle for News”).

Woodward often avows, in his flat Midwestern accent, “I am just a ra-por-ter” (Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 237) trying to find out what happened rather than an analyst of the events he writes about, as if facts and their interpretation are always, irrevocably separate, but in trying somehow to hold them apart, Woodward has left himself open to manipulation by his anonymous sources, an argument Shepard makes, ironically, by citing an anonymous source:

I think there are a number of cases where smart, smooth operators have fooled him and have figured out his appetite for the detail that he loves – the quotations, the atmosphere, the color, the dress, and so on, and they get the best of him....People learn that if ‘I give him that stuff, then I can give him my personal spin’ (235).

Asking sources for material to help reconstruct a scene is not automatically a problem, as will be discussed in the next chapter, but it is for Woodward because he needs a lot of such assistance as he has not witnessed most of the events he writes about, because he is reliant on people practiced in the dark arts of manipulation, and because his goal is to write about politics in a narrative mode. The core ethical problem, then, in the research phase is that Woodward transplants what is a difficult, easily abused practice in daily journalism – the use of anonymous sources – into book-length journalism where he makes it, almost literally, his trademark. In doing this, he resolves none of the problems of anonymous sourcing. He actually disregards the time available to practitioners of book-length journalism to build relationships and persuade his highly placed sources to speak on the record.

The time available to practitioners of book-length journalism begs reconsideration of the common (but not universal) newsroom practice of not showing sources what has been written before publication for fear of the source trying to retract what they have said on the record or of taking pre-emptive legal action. This occupational anxiety can be diminished in book-length journalism where there is more time to make and fulfil agreements, whether verbal or written, to ensure sources have an opportunity to correct factual errors and put their view about the practitioner’s interpretations. Sources can sue for libel or take legal action to prevent a book’s publication, but this strategy often backfires, drawing even more attention to the book. On this question, Boynton’s interviewees in *The New New Journalism* are divided. Three of them – Finnegan (95-96), Krakauer (167) and Orlean (286-287) – do not allow sources to see what has been written before publication but five of them do – Cramer (46), Kotlowitz (138), Preston (313), Weschler (425) and Wright (446). A practitioner’s willingness to read back a source’s quotations will depend on the volatility of the subject being written about as well as a desire for accuracy. The key point is that the time available to practitioners of book-length journalism gives them more flexibility in their dealings with sources; sometimes the checking process with sources leads to

better understanding and even fresh material because it demonstrates the practitioner's commitment to accuracy. For Preston the "fact-checking interview" becomes another interview in which "often the most important and interesting material flows forth" (314). Checking material with sources does not include giving them power of veto over the book's contents, according to these five practitioners.

The majority of journalists working on book-length projects prefer to interview their principal sources and observe them first-hand, primarily because the opportunity to interview sources at length and observe them closely over time yields material that is otherwise rarely available. Book-length journalism is replete with such examples; an early one is Orwell's *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1936), much of whose energy derives from Orwell's vivid reporting of his first-hand observation of life and mining work in northern England. Wolfe's *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (1968) is grounded in his extended observation of Ken Kesey and his "Merry Pranksters." More recently, in *Stasiland*, Funder conducted remarkably empathic interviews for her account of life for ordinary East Germans since the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989. Among them was one with a woman who had been forced to choose between informing on a man helping others to get over the wall and reuniting with her severely disabled infant son, who was receiving treatment in a West German hospital. She refused to be an informer, was tortured by the secret police, and imprisoned for four years. Funder comments:

It is so hard to know what kind of mortgage our acts put on our future. Frau Paul had the courage to make the right decision by her conscience in a situation where most people would decide to see their baby, and tell themselves later they had no choice. Once made though, her decision took a whole new fund of courage to live with. It seems to me that Frau Paul, as one does, may have overestimated her own strength, her resistance to damage, and that she is now, for her principles, a lonely, teary, guilt-wracked wreck (221).

Frau Paul helped numerous people escape to West Germany but did not see herself as brave, which to Funder was the most tragic element of her account, "that the picture she has of herself is one that the Stasi made for her." Funder's comments could be read as personal, even invasive, but coming at the end of sixteen pages

closely describing the interview, they read to me as deeply compassionate. That Funder was able to devote to Frau Paul the time mostly unavailable to newspaper and magazine journalists is critical; so, too, is a commitment to researching people and events with empathy (Joseph “Retelling Untellable Stories”).

There is broad agreement among scholars and practitioners that once journalists pay for information or enter into financial relationships with sources their editorial independence is open to compromise even if in newspaper and magazine journalism it is usually the company employing the journalist that drives the decision and makes the payment (Hurst and White *Ethics and the Australian News Media* 195-215; Sanders *Ethics & Journalism* 115-16). Distinguishing the journalist and their employer does not remove the potential weakening of the information’s value, but in book-length journalism where the practitioner’s primary commercial relationship is with their publisher, the first potential issue is if the practitioner agrees to pay a principal source or share proceeds from the book, as in the agreement between McGinniss and Macdonald for *Fatal Vision*, which was widely condemned by fellow practitioners (Gottlieb “Dangerous Liaisons”). Sometimes practitioners act as “ghost-writers” either on behalf of or in cooperation with the principal source, usually a celebrity of some kind, and in these cases royalties are shared or the ghost-writer paid a one-off fee. The expectation of this particular sub-genre is that the ghost-writer is acting as an agent of the source and will include in the book only what the source wants included, which means the journalist gives up their editorial independence and the resulting work is not considered book-length journalism, as defined in this thesis.

The spread of celebrity culture and of people using new media technologies to make their own media has prompted a keen sense of the commercial worth of people’s own experiences and stories. It is possible, then, that journalists working on book-length projects will encounter a principal source represented by an agent aiming to extract the maximum amount of money for the minimum level of scrutiny; in other words, requiring a ghost-writer. Practitioners unwilling to act as ghost-writers may still question the convention of never paying for information on the ground that principal sources involved in a book-length project, and perhaps other sources too, may give the journalist months of their time and energy, emotional and otherwise. Krakauer

told Boynton the blanket opposition to paying sources that is widely taught in journalism schools is a self-serving axiom:

According to the accepted standards it's okay to buy a subject a nice dinner, but it's not okay to pay them cold hard cash? That's so patronizing. We have the right to enrich ourselves off of these people whose lives we may ruin, but we never, under any circumstances, owe them anything? Give me a fucking break (169).

What Krakauer did when researching *Under the Banner of Heaven*, a book about fundamentalist Mormon brothers who had slain a sister-in-law and niece in a ritual murder, was, he felt, a step forward but still a compromise. He bought one-off literary rights to a fundamentalist Mormon woman's memoir that he did not really need because she had already told him everything in it during their interviews; she was poor, however, and he wanted to compensate her for her time (Boynton 169).

One way to combat the difficulties posed by paying sources is to disclose any financial relationship, giving readers the opportunity to assess whether payment affects the quality of the book. This is a practice advocated by the innovative and influential media watchdog magazine, *Brill's Content*, during its three-year life from 1998 to 2001 (Hayes *Press Critics Are the Fifth Estate* 85-102). Krakauer did not disclose in *Under the Banner of Heaven* the payment he made for the memoirs but it appears journalists who write books rarely do. McGinniss's agreement became public only because of MacDonald's civil suit. On occasion, practitioners make clear they did not pay their principal sources for information (Ricketson *Paul Jennings* 304). Practitioners' reluctance to disclose financial agreements with principal sources may stem from a desire to preserve their own privacy as much as their anxiety over readers perceiving payment as tainting the book's independence. One practitioner who probably regrets the decision to disclose is Gitta Sereny who in 1998 wrote a book entitled *Cries Unheard* about Mary Bell, who in 1968 as an eleven year old girl had murdered two boys aged three and four in Newcastle, England. Sereny had reported on the murder trial, which not surprisingly stirred enormous public interest, and had written a book about it at the time. She had since followed Bell's life in special detention centres and prison as she grew up.

By 1995 Bell was in a stable relationship with a man and had a young daughter; her mother had died and she began to feel able to confront her past, including her mother's four attempts to kill her as a child and sexual abuse of her by including Mary in her work as a prostitute. Sereny is a distinguished practitioner who has written extensively about Nazi Germany, notably a work of book-length journalism, *Into That Darkness*, about the commandant of Treblinka extermination camp, Franz Stangl. Her continuing preoccupation with Bell's case derives from her belief that parents, the judicial system and society as a whole do not heed the cries of disturbed children until it is too late ("Introduction" xxviii). She considered sharing her advance and book royalties with Bell in the hope that the money would be used to help support Bell's child and because without Bell the book could not be written, which echoes Krakauer's view. Sereny also knew it would be deeply distressing for Bell to re-live her childhood experience (*Cries Unheard* 17).

Both Sereny and Bell knew the families of the murdered boys would find it very difficult to condone Bell receiving any payment for the book; they suspected the daily news media would be outraged even though various news organizations had previously offered Bell well over UK100,000 pounds for her story, offers that often had been solicited by Bell's mother ("Introduction to the Paperback" xvii). The predicted media frenzy ensued and though Bell's identity and whereabouts were protected by law – she had changed her name several times because journalists had found her – she was found again by the news media. She and her daughter were forced to flee under blankets as the cameras whirred. The Press Complaints Commission heard a complaint about the payment to Bell, as the book had been serialized in *The Times*, bringing it into the commission's bailiwick. The commission dismissed the complaint as under the law payments to criminals extend only to crimes committed within the past six years, and, though it had received no formal complaint about the media's harassment the commission expressed great sympathy for the plight of Bell's daughter (406-14).

Paying a convicted child murderer presents a thicket of ethical questions; what is clear though is the careful way Sereny tried to steer her way through them, not with unqualified success as she acknowledges. Her publication record shows a journalist committed to exploring rather than sensationalizing issues, and she chooses profoundly disturbing issues to explore. Here she sought to use "phronesis" or

practical wisdom to find a way through the problem. She raised the possibility of payment to Bell not, it appears, as a way of persuading her to cooperate but in recognition of the cost, both material and emotional, to Bell of cooperating with Sereny between 1995 and the book's publication in 1998. It is important, too, that she talked through, with Bell and others, the problem posed by the proposed payment, and she disclosed the arrangement to readers at the outset (15-19). The point is not that Sereny's payment of Bell was the only course of action available; other practitioners might have decided otherwise, which is an outcome envisaged and defended by virtue ethicists as exemplifying the capacity of the theory to encompass the complexity of life (Oakley and Cocking 33). It is hard to fault the seriousness and sincerity with which Sereny considered her ethical choices and sought to pursue the virtues of both social justice and compassion. It is also hard to find anything but fault in the actions of Sereny's daily news colleagues who not only repeatedly invaded the privacy of Bell's innocent daughter but swiftly and sanctimoniously condemned the agreement after themselves routinely offering money for the "story" of the person they described in headlines as an "Evil Monster" ("Introduction" xx).

If the forming of a financial relationship between journalist and source is at best vulnerable to misinterpretation and at worst untenable, then the forming of a personal relationship between a journalist working on a book and a source throws up equally thorny issues. It is proposed there are three main areas of concern here: first, where journalists write books about people with whom they have a personal relationship, whether family, friend or lover; second, where the journalist forms a personal relationship with a source, and third, where the journalist feigns a personal relationship with a source, or so blurs the line between the personal and the professional that the journalist or the principal source, or both, are confused about the nature of their relationship. This last area of concern has already been dealt with in discussing *The Journalist and the Murderer* and *In Cold Blood*. At one end of the spectrum are sexual relationships. There is little readily available information about sexual or intimate relationships between journalists working on book-length projects and their principal sources but the issue has been controversial in anthropology, as detailed in Don Kulick and Margaret Wilson's edited collection of essays entitled *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. There was a much debated instance in a field related to book-length journalism –

documentary – where the Australian documentarian Dennis O’Rourke went to Thailand with the stated aim of hiring a prostitute and making a film about the result. Released in 1991, *The Good Woman of Bangkok* disclosed the relationship to viewers and the film was commercially successful but it also provoked outrage and, in some cases, approval (Chris Berry “Exploitation or Exposure”; Williams “The Ethics of Intervention”).

None of the journalists interviewed by Boynton or for this thesis advocate forming sexual or intimate relationships with sources; nor do the American or Australian codes of ethics, but it would be naïve to think such relationships do not occur or that they do not add something to the texture of a work of book-length journalism. But it would seem clear that a journalist’s judgement would be coloured, probably clouded, if they have a sexual or intimate relationship with a source and that if the practitioner and principal source wanted to complete the project, the relationship should be disclosed to readers regardless of the privacy implications. The Australian journalist and novelist Blanche d’Alpuget had an adulterous affair with Bob Hawke before she wrote a biography of the trade union leader that not only sold well but was important in persuading people within the Labor Party that Hawke was a serious contender for the party’s leadership, from where he won the 1983 federal election and became prime minister. D’Alpuget’s biography played down his womanizing and made no mention of their affair. Long rumoured in political and media circles, these details were only confirmed twenty-six years after publication when d’Alpuget, by then Hawke’s wife, gave an interview to publicize an essay she wrote entitled “On Longing” in which she referred to Hawke as “the Muse” and, later, “M.” As a biography of someone still alive written primarily in a narrative mode, d’Alpuget’s *Robert J. Hawke* can be seen as book-length journalism. Long regarded as the most successful of several books about Hawke, d’Alpuget’s biography is diminished by her failure to disclose important, relevant information to readers and by her willingness to fashion the book for party political advantage (Legge “The Secret Life of Blanche”).

Writing about friends and family raises important issues but such works are moving closer to memoir or autobiography and are beyond the scope of this thesis. The journalist who forms a personal relationship with a source, who becomes a friend in effect, faces a choice when writing their book of putting their new friend’s interests

ahead of the reader's interests. If they choose the former they are unlikely to write anything that reflects poorly on the source/friend, and so weaken the book's claims to veracity. If they opt for the latter, they may offend or upset the source/friend because at some point in a work of book-length journalism the source's flaws or foibles or blind spots will in all likelihood need to be written about. It is important to note that writing something revealing a source in a poor light is no more a precondition of book-length journalism than revealing the source in a good light. Examining people and issues in a book-length project is aimed at portraying them in their complexity. Neither the journalist nor the source will necessarily know how the source will be presented until the book is written; friendship between the two is unlikely to help either party. Journalists seeking friends through their book-length projects are probably asking for trouble; it does seem a roundabout way to build your social circle.

Sometimes, however, the process of working together on a book-length project as journalist and source leads to a personal relationship. The question arises, will the journalist write about the source again or does their personal relationship preclude this. McPhee and Bill Bradley both attended Princeton University, but a dozen years apart, and in 1965 when Bradley was establishing himself as a college basketballer of rare skill and grace, McPhee profiled him for *The New Yorker*. The article was published in book form with the title *A Sense of Where You Are*. An updated edition outlining Bradley's professional basketball career was published in 1978 and was updated again in 1999 to include photographs and captions about Bradley's political career as a senator. By then the two men had known each other for more than three decades and their relationship was, by McPhee's description, brotherly ("1999 Addenda" unpaginated). He said he had not written about Bradley since they became friends, with the exception of the brief material included in the updates to his original profile and a lightly observed piece about a day Bradley spent campaigning in New Jersey. There is clearly a lot more McPhee knows and could say about Bradley but the effect of him becoming friends with Bradley is to circumscribe what he feels able to write.

Instead of becoming personally involved, practitioners could resolve the issue by maintaining a professional relationship but how exactly does the journalist establish a professional relationship with a source, and how do the journalist, and the source,

negotiate its boundaries? The term professional carries connotations of an established code of behaviour, an accrediting body with the power to include or exclude, guidelines for the exchange of money between the parties, promises of confidentiality and a prescribed level of personal interaction between the parties. Taking these one by one, the codes of ethics for newspaper and magazine journalists discussed earlier do not envisage the kind of relationships practitioners of book-length journalism may develop with principal sources. There is no accrediting or licensing body in the United States or Australia (Wilkins and Christians *Handbook of Mass Media Ethics* 20-21; Hurst and White *Ethics and the Australian News Media* 19-20 254-55). Where most professional relationships are predicated on a client paying the professional, in book-length journalism no money changes hands or if it does it is from the professional (journalist) to the client (source). As to confidentiality, the codes of ethics have clauses protecting the identity of sources, but the purpose of journalism is to make information public.

The impetus for *The Journalist and the Murderer* was Kornstein's letter to Malcolm and other journalists, but usually it is the practitioner who needs to persuade the principal source to be involved in the project, and at first glance it is not an especially alluring pitch to make. The journalist will ask the source to spend dozens, perhaps hundreds, of hours with them, ask them sometimes personal and confronting questions, will scrutinize their answers from alternative perspectives, and then write a book where it is entirely possible the source will be portrayed unfavourably. In return, the journalist offers publicity, an outlet for the source to give their version of events or views on the subject of the book, and the satisfaction of contributing to what in many cases is a socially useful project. It is not hard to see that a dash of charm goes a long way for journalists working on book-length projects. Charming or charmless, though, practitioners are unlikely to gain full cooperation from principal sources unless they establish a trusting relationship. Some practitioners will demonstrate their bona fides by showing prospective sources examples of their previous work (Kramer "Breakable Rules for Literary Journalists" 26), but as several have found, the fact that the journalist is working on a book rather than a newspaper or magazine article carries weight. Knox says: "A journalist sort of buzzes in and buzzes out and never gets it quite right because they haven't put the time in. If you say to somebody that you are writing a book, you are paying that subject the same

respect they have for the topic” (Personal interview). Echoing Knox, Wright told Boynton: “People are naturally interested in talking about themselves and their pursuits, and if you can convince them of the genuineness of your interest, it’s a rare person who doesn’t want to satisfy your curiosity” (*The New New Journalism* 443).

If, to rephrase Goethe, curiosity has a power and a magic of its own, it can also be applied to politicians though a shrewd strategy is needed to pierce politicians’ resistance to the media, as Cramer found in researching what grew into a 1047 page book entitled *What It Takes*, which one reviewer dubbed “What It Weighs” (Boynton 33). It is an account of the 1988 American presidential campaign contested by George Bush Sr. for the Republicans and Michael Dukakis for the Democrats. Cramer gradually gained access, first by being around for long periods simply watching while other journalists asked the standard journalistic questions about policies and gaffes and backflips. Eventually the candidates became so comfortable with his presence that they would lean over after an interview and say, “*Damn, I fucked up that agriculture question again!*” (Italics in original 38). At that moment, Cramer recalled, he had differentiated himself from the other journalists who needed to be given the “message of the day” and he began to get the kind of material he was seeking. The impetus for his project had been the gap he observed between the wooden performance of politicians on television and the vibrant politicians he had known in his home town. He was interested in exploring what happens to politicians on the journey to the White House. Cramer’s second strategy was to introduce himself to all the candidates at the outset then go away for a year to research their backgrounds. This had the dual effect of impressing on the candidates his diligence, and he also found interesting material by interviewing the candidates’ friends, families and schoolmates:

What amazes me is that most journalists won’t bother talking to the people who *love* these guys. They only want to talk to the critics....But they are missing the point. The important question is *how* is he wonderful! If you want to understand how someone got to the point where he is a credible candidate for president of a nation of 250 million people, you’d *better* goddamn-well know *how* he is wonderful (Italics in original Boynton 41).

Even assuming the journalist has been successful in persuading one principal source to cooperate, that person's involvement may make it harder for the journalist to persuade other key sources to participate. Harr, for instance, gained excellent access to one side of the legal team in the lawsuit featured in *A Civil Action* and moderate access to the other side. A reviewer criticized him over this (Boynton 111-12) and was entitled to do so, but among the controversial and difficult issues and events that attract practitioners of book-length projects it is rare for all significant sources to make themselves available. Book-length projects exist along two intersecting lines, one representing full immersion in a principal source's world, the other representing a panoply of perspectives on an issue. Most practitioners aim to occupy the furthest end of both lines; usually they find themselves stretched somewhat painfully between the two, leaning toward one end or the other. LeBlanc opted to completely immerse herself in the lives of several Latino families in the Bronx over an astounding eleven year period for *Random Family* (406) while Rosenbaum succeeded in covering an exhaustive range of historians, filmmakers and propagandists who have written about Nazi Germany for *Explaining Hitler*. Marr's biography of Patrick White is a rare example of a journalist gaining excellent access while retaining almost total independence. White was still alive while Marr did his research so the journalist had access to him, but White did not seek to prevent him speaking to any of his numerous enemies. White read the final manuscript but did not attempt to veto it, instead uttering the words "I must be the monster of all time" after finishing it (Marr Personal interview).

The consensus of Boynton's nineteen interviewees and the Australian practitioners interviewed for this thesis is that the relationship with principal sources has both personal and professional elements. This is not altogether surprising, given that both parties work closely and intensely together on a project that both regard as important, albeit from different perspectives. It is not easy for either party to disentangle the kind of relationship that might develop from legitimate personal interaction and the kind of interaction that might jeopardize the project. The framework outlined by Oakley and Cocking and discussed in chapter one offers a way for practitioners of book-length journalism to navigate this path. Within the norms of their profession, practitioners identify with their role to both learn as much about their chosen subject as possible, which may mean becoming close to principal sources, and to disclose

material that in other contexts would remain private. To rephrase Oakley and Cocking, practitioners' "concern for the particular and concrete individuals" who are their principal sources are "best conceived as agent-relative to the agent" qua journalist rather than to "the agent qua friend" (*Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles* 99).

If the McGinnis-MacDonald and Capote-Smith relationships alert us to the perils of the journalist-source relationship, there are numerous examples throughout Boynton's book of journalist-source relationships that marry ethical responsibility, personal engagement and revelatory material. The same applies to some Australian practitioners' relationships with principal sources, such as Blackburn and Button, Simons and various Ngarrindjeri women and Marr and White. When Marr was researching his work, he successfully applied for a A\$25,000 grant from the Australian Bicentennial Authority but warned White about its imminent announcement because he knew White opposed the nation's then coming bicentenary, in 1988. White said to him: "It's your decision of course but I would prefer it if you turned it down." Marr did so; he could see how White's opposition could be misrepresented if the government-funded authority was financially supporting a biography of him. Marr describes his decision as both "personal and strategic." He needed White's cooperation to be able to draw on letters for which the author held copyright but he had also "come to like him, in a wary sort of way." When White subsequently learnt how much money Marr had given up, "he was flabbergasted and there was almost nothing that he wouldn't do. Boy, was that the right decision on my part" (Personal interview).

Some of Boynton's interviewees, such as Kotliwicz (137), Orlean (283) and Talese (365), place slightly more emphasis on the personal qualities of the relationship, while others such as Dash (64-65), Harr (116) and Krakauer (168) lean toward the professional qualities. Juggling the various elements is what makes the relationship "very ethically sticky" as Harr puts it (120). It is noteworthy that Malcolm's characterization of the journalist-source relationship is not dismissed out of hand by Boynton's interviewees as it has been by many newspaper and magazine journalists. Most have clearly considered it in arriving at their own ethical standpoints and some such as Harr and Krakauer explicitly endorse it (119-20 and 166-67). Says Krakauer: "I tell the person I'm interviewing that he'll have no control over the process, that I

won't show the article [or book] to him before publication, that he will tell me things he'll regret...and none of that deters anyone!" (167). Malcolm makes a similar point at the end of *The Journalist and the Murderer* when she compares sources to young Aztec men and women selected for sacrifice. "And still they say yes when a journalist calls, and still they are astonished when they see the flash of the knife" (145).

Where sources' propensity to "sacrifice" themselves prods Malcolm to condemn the relationship as a "canker," what impresses about Boynton's interviewees is how their reflections enact Aristotle's notion of the mean whereby "the middle course occurs at the right time, towards the right people, for the right motives, and in the right manner" (Christians et al. *Media Ethics* 14). For instance, when Langewiesche thought he heard people saying things in his presence at the World Trade Centre disaster area in 2001 without knowing he was a journalist, he would ensure they knew who he was and would not report what they had said (*The New New Journalism* 217). LeBlanc could have been present when one of the principal sources in *Random Family* returned to her family after ten years in jail but chose not to as she felt she would have been intruding (245). When Conover was working undercover as a prison guard at Sing Sing prison, another officer invited him home after work to spend time with his family but Conover declined. A reviewer of his book in *The New York Times* asked: "Where are the stories of the men he is guarding and the officers he is guarding them with?" (Boynton 18). Conover acknowledges the gap but as he was working undercover he felt he needed to distinguish between the work and private lives of his (then) fellow officers. "I didn't think it was morally defensible for me to secretly learn about people's private lives for the sake of the book" (18). Defensible though his decision is, and perhaps as a way of compensating for this apparent gap, Conover gives readers an insight into how working undercover in a demanding job seeps into his private life, affecting his marriage and relationship with his young children (*Newjack* 242-49).

In all three cases, it is easy to imagine journalists putting the needs of their project ahead of those they were writing about. All three journalists knew the potential value of the material they were giving up but did so anyway. All three demonstrated not only an ability to weigh the claims of legitimate competing interests but lived the virtues of justice and compassion and arrived at their decision by applying Aristotle's

practical wisdom. Nor, it appears, were their books any the poorer for these omissions. Langewiesche's *American Ground*, LeBlanc's *Random Family* and Conover's *Newjack* offer vividly detailed and revelatory accounts of, respectively, the clean up at ground zero after the September 11 terrorist attacks, life for impoverished Latino families in the Bronx and the work of prison guards. Conover's account illustrates not only the calibre of his ethical decision-making but the real cost to him and his family of his project. The three practitioners' works and experiences illustrate the force of a remark made by Harrington, a fellow practitioner and a journalism academic, that those who do not encounter ethical issues in writing what he terms "intimate journalism" are not digging deep enough; alternatively, "you're either a schmuck or not really facing the ethical dilemmas" (Sims and Kramer *Literary Journalism* 154).

Implicit in the acknowledgment by leading practitioners that their relationship with principal sources contains both professional and personal elements is a sense of the boundaries between and around the two ways of engaging with sources. Researching her book about the Hindmarsh Island controversy, Simons sometimes shared a meal with her principal sources but always made clear her purpose for being there – gathering material for a book. "If you do become a friend I think at that point the ethical problems are huge. There is a degree to which I would say you shouldn't become a friend, but that is not the same as saying that you don't become friendly" (Personal interview). Dash developed strict rules for his in-depth reporting about urban poverty in predominantly black neighbourhoods in which he lived for months at a time getting to know those he was writing about for multi-part series for *The Washington Post* that were later published in book form (Boynton 53-57). He did not accept Christmas gifts from the adolescent mothers he was writing about in *When Children Want Children* because, he explained to them, he was working. He found the experience painful and difficult but "I don't want them to see me as their friend. I'm a reporter" (Boynton 64). Working on another project about a woman named Rosa Lee who was a heroin addict, mother of eight and grandmother of two, he said he never gave her any money as he believed she would use it to buy drugs and told her he would not be witness to any crimes but she stole anyway and he was angry at her and, later, at himself. "It was very egotistical of me to insist that when she was with me she behave so differently from the way she normally behaved" (65). Like

anthropologists, practitioners of book-length journalism immersing themselves in the lives and cultures of their principal sources may find themselves becoming personally involved, but the experience of Boynton's interviewees and others is that they retain a commitment to writing about what they find even if that distresses or offends their principal sources. By comparison, in anthropology the goal of "telling a story as intimately as possible from the standpoint of the groups being studied" can lead to "a certain measure of idealization" (Cramer and McDevitt "Ethnographic Journalism" 132). For instance, Simons argues in *The Meeting of the Waters* that the work of Diane Bell, a prominent anthropologist, while detailed and useful, also "sugar-coated" the Ngarrindjeri women. Kartinyeri was portrayed only as a "softly-spoken Elder. There was nothing of her bite, her wiriness or her anger." Bell's book also had little about "the bitter factional battles that explained some of the reasons the Ngarrindjeri had behaved as they had" (*The Meeting of the Waters* 424).

In the light of these practitioners' careful negotiation of their relationships with principal sources and their commitment to readers, how do they fare with the issue that flummoxed McGinniss, namely that if he was honest with MacDonald he would lose his precious access? None of Boynton's interviewees said they been as duplicitous but a minority said they had allowed sources whose views they found repellent to continue talking without offering their own view. Finnegan described this as "one of the not-very-secret tawdry little secrets of journalism" (95) while Kramer and Conover said they were not by nature confrontational and are more inclined, as Conover says, to understand a racist's point of view rather than "teach him about mine" (16). The majority, though, said they were willing to confront interviewees if they disagreed with them over an issue or when they believed they were lying. Lewis, author of eight works of book-length journalism, says "If I've got criticisms, I find it useful to lay them out and see how they respond. It's all good material" (262), while Preston, author of the bestselling book about an ebola virus outbreak, *The Hot Zone*, says he has learnt from interviewing FBI agents for another book-length project the importance of remaining calm in the face of lies. The FBI agents, he says, simply "point out contradictions between the evidence and the suspect's statements" (310).

Where Lewis' stance appears essentially pragmatic and Preston has learnt an effective way to confront difficult sources, Kotlowitz keeps in mind the needs of his

readers. Researching the death of a black teenage boy found floating in a river that ran between a black community and a white community in southwestern Michigan, Kotlowitz was told by one black woman it was inconceivable the boy had tried to swim because “we don’t swim. We don’t run to the water” (Boynton 140). Kotlowitz says the comment brought to mind a remark made on national television by Al Campanis, general manager of the Los Angeles Dodgers, that blacks lacked the natural buoyancy to swim. He says he had to challenge the woman’s remarks “because otherwise I’d be left thinking, as would my readers, ‘Why didn’t I ask her the next logical question?’ I’d risk losing my connection to my reader” (Boynton 140). Equally important, these statements prompted Kotlowitz to think about why such views prevailed. “And I learned much of it had to do with the ambiguous place of rivers in African American history” (140). Cramer has firm views, saying he learnt from newspaper reporting in Baltimore that if he needed to criticize a source in print he should let the source know ahead of deadline. “One politician who was my *friend* was sent to jail because of what I and others wrote in the paper. But I told him what I was doing every step of the way....I told him he might want to tell his wife before it hit. And he appreciated that. He sent me gifts from jail” (44). Perhaps even more bracing is to see the lengths that Sereny went to inform Bell about the likely additional problems she would face if Sereny agreed to Bell’s proposal that she give her version of how she committed murder at the age of eleven.

Did she realize, I asked her, that such a book was bound to be controversial? That people would think she did it for money? That both of us would be accused of insensitivity towards the two little victims’ families by bringing their dreadful tragedy back into the limelight and, almost inevitably, of sensationalism, because of some of the material the book would have to contain? Above all, did she understand that readers would not stand for any suggestion of possible mitigation for her crimes? (Sereny 16).

Sereny has deep compassion for Bell as is evident throughout *Cries Unheard* but she does not hesitate from confronting her when she believes Bell is lying or being manipulative. It is entirely possible, then, for journalists working on book-length projects to disagree with their sources and maintain a working relationship. It could

be argued that openness between practitioner and principal sources about the project and a preparedness to discuss disagreements are barometers of good practice

What emerges from examining the research phase of three major works of book-length journalism – *The Journalist and the Murderer*, *In Cold Blood* and *The Final Days* – and from leading practitioners' reflections is how important to an understanding and evaluation of book-length journalism is the work done in this phase. In *The Journalist and the Murderer* Malcolm opens up the Macdonald vs McGinniss lawsuit in uniquely interesting ways even as she distorts its facts. Capote becomes deeply confused about the boundaries between personal involvement and professional distance in his long-term engagement with Smith. Woodward imports from newspaper to book-length journalism a complex and troublesome practice – the use of anonymous sources – without thinking through whether it is applicable or whether he can ameliorate its difficulties by using other research methods.

Malcolm's work has spurred many leading practitioners of book-length journalism to think about the nature of the journalist-source relationship. Their experiences make them only too aware how complex and subtle a process it is to find the point along the continuum between the professional and the personal that works for them, their principal source and their project. Where Malcolm characterizes the journalist-source relationship as inescapably enacting a pattern of seduction and betrayal, these leading practitioners know that may have happened with some colleagues but that it does not have to. In their experience journalists can enter into and maintain an ethical relationship with principal sources that takes on elements of ethnography such as informed consent and that continues common journalistic understandings of editorial independence. In many cases they will allow their sources to check material for accuracy and in some cases they will remunerate principal sources for their extended commitment, and will disclose that to readers. For Malcolm "nothing can be done" about the falseness inherent in the journalist-source relationship; for these leading practitioners a good deal can and is being done.

CHAPTER FIVE: ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING IN REPRESENTING PEOPLE, EVENTS AND ISSUES IN BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM

The difference between fiction and non-fiction is that you have to make things up for fiction, which is surprisingly hard work. You can't do that for non-fiction, although sometimes you might wish you could. Fiction and non-fiction are different activities. That sounds obvious, but it is very important. In non-fiction you are asking the reader to allow you to lead them on a journey and if you mislead them about what they are reading then like all lying it is an abuse of power. It's not as bad as police corruption, of course, but it is an abuse of power, and wrong for that reason.

Margaret Simons (Personal interview 2007).

In the previous chapter on the research phase of book-length journalism the focus of inquiry was the relationship between practitioners and their principal sources. In the writing phase the primary relationship is between the journalist and the book they are creating. The practitioner gathers all their material not for a private diary but for a public act of communication. Where in the research phase journalists enact the virtue of justice by finding out what is happening in society, in the writing phase they pursue social justice by trying to reach the broadest possible audience. The relationship practitioners seek to establish with readers and readers' expectations of book-length journalism will be discussed in the next chapter. It is acknowledged that practitioners may well continue to talk to their principal sources during the writing phase and that as they write they consider their relationship with the reader, which is simply to say the process is more fluid and inter-connected than is suggested in the confines of a linear argument. Bearing that in mind, the subject of this chapter is the ethical issues arising for journalists in representing through words on a page what

they found in their research about actual people and events. Their first decision is whether to write primarily in what is termed in this thesis an expository or a narrative mode. Where the former is used for hard news reports and is still the most common form for presenting news, it is fuelled by information and strips out emotion, analysis and context. If extended to book-length, the hard news report makes dull reading. Editors leaven readers' news diets with offerings from other journalistic food groups, such as features, sport, fashion, crosswords and cartoons. That option is not really open to book-length journalism (though photographs and illustrations have their appeal). The majority of practitioners choose to write primarily in the narrative mode, but the decision is not simply pragmatic. It is usually propelled by a desire to write about an event or person or issue at a depth beyond that available in newspapers or magazines and a belief that the narrative mode connects more fully with readers.

The ethics of representation is present whichever mode the practitioner chooses, but as the narrative mode throws up more complex ethical issues, it will require most attention here. Journalism written in a narrative mode prompts the question: how does the reader know whether they are reading fiction or non-fiction? The answer is that they don't unless they are told (Abbott *Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* 147-50). That prompts a further question: does it matter whether the reader knows or believes they are reading fiction or non-fiction, which opens into a larger debate about whether journalists can, however imperfectly, report on events in the actual world, or whether in the face of crumbling belief in positivist notions of a simple objective reality, journalists are seen as one group among several in society that construct reality through words and images. These debates are critical to a field like book-length journalism that is grounded in the practice of representing in words actual people, events and issues in print. These debates, too, are characterized by the conflating of various concepts, which has the effect of muddying rather than clarifying complex ideas. In chapter one I argued that the choice by scholars and critics to study non-fiction works according to their literary merit has the effect of submerging the question of whether the ethical issues arising in representing people, events and issues hinges on the taking of a narrative approach rather than the practitioner's literary ability. Here I want to highlight how some scholars conflate

notions of narrative with fiction, of fiction with literariness, and of fiction with non-fiction.

Hayden White is discussing history when he points to the literary element of that activity (“The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” 81-100), but his argument can and has been extended to book-length journalism (Smith “John McPhee Balances the Act” 206-27). “Historical situations are not inherently tragic, comic, or romantic” but only made so, writes White, “by the historian’s subtlety in matching up a specific plot structure with the set of historical events that he wishes to endow with a meaning of a particular kind” (“The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” 85). White’s argument, developed over several works, has been influential in undermining belief in a naïve historical realism and in drawing attention to the extent to which historians, and by implication journalists, construct plots and meanings for the events and people they write about. The value of the work of White, among others, has been to shake “narrative theory out of the complacency with which it has long approached non-fiction. If rhetorical devices produce meaning in fiction, so do they in non-fiction,” writes Marie-Laure Ryan in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory* published in 2005 (Herman, Jahn and Ryan 418). Lubomír Doležel, however, draws attention to how White’s argument is founded on a non-sequitur. White writes that endowing a set of historical events with a specific plot structure is “essentially a literary, that is to say fiction-making operation” (“The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” 85), which means, as Doležel points out: “The equating of history and fiction is smuggled into the postmodernist paradigm by a tautology. Emplotment is a literary operation; therefore, history is tantamount to fiction-making” (“Fictional and Historical Narrative” 251).

Doležel argues that White’s position founders when he is asked, and agrees, to take what Doležel calls “the Holocaust test” (251-53). That is, can the Holocaust, like other historical events, be plotted as a comedy or must it be seen as a tragedy? White shifts the argument from a consideration of how the facts of the genocide of six million people can be represented in a limited number of ways to a broader consideration of whether there are any limits “on the *kind* of story that can responsibly be told about these phenomena?” (Italics in original “Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth” 37). There is a logical hole in the assumptions underlying White’s position; if historians (and journalists) draw from

concepts usually associated with fiction – tragedy, comedy, romance – presumably these concepts originated in novelists’ experience, and re-imagining, of the world. That is, life preceded fiction. The interplay between life as experienced and as rendered in fiction is more complicated than White’s argument allows; equally the dividing line between historical facts and historians’ interpretation of them is not definitively drawn but continually feeds back and forth, enriching both the finding of facts and the making of interpretations. In taking the Holocaust test, though, White continues to distinguish between facts and “poetic and rhetorical elements by which what would otherwise be a list of facts is transformed into a story” (38) as if facts did not need to be unearthed in the first place by historians (and journalists) and that those facts may surprise practitioners and run entirely counter to any preconceptions they have about an event. If the belief that historians’ portrayal of events can accurately reflect objective reality is naïve and simplistic, so too is the belief that there is no reality but only our representation and “emplotment” of it.

The use by Doložel of possible worlds semantics is valuable in teasing out and clarifying the points of difference between fiction and non-fiction (“Fictional and Historical Narrative” 247-273). Possible worlds semantics acknowledges the inability of language to express reality directly: “The only kind of worlds that human language is capable of creating or producing is possible worlds” (253). To begin with, fiction writers are “free to roam over the entire universe of possible worlds, to call into fictional existence a world of any type,” including fantasy worlds and the supernatural (256). Verisimilitude is required in some kinds of fiction but is not a universal principle of fiction whereas historians engage in a continuous refining of historical worlds, supplementing or re-writing history according to the state of available sources.

An apposite example, given Doložel’s invoking of the Holocaust test in his discussion of White’s work, is a book entitled *The Destruction of Dresden* and published in 1963 that was written by David Irving. Even after Irving became a public and virulent Holocaust denier his book on Dresden continued to be well regarded by historians until 1999 when Irving sued an American author Deborah Lipstadt over her portrayal of him in her book *Denying the Holocaust* (D.D. Guttenplan *The Holocaust on Trial* 1-16). For the trial, another historian, Richard Evans, conducted a forensic examination of all the primary and secondary sources

Irving relied on and demonstrated that Irving's work on Dresden was fraudulent. Evans found Irving had fabricated evidence, had used a forged document that gave a wildly inflated number of bombing victims even after he had been told it was a fake, and had refused to use a genuine document that provided a more accurate number of victims. (Guttenplan 225-26). What this example illustrates, courtesy of a lucid work of book-length journalism by D.D. Guttenplan, is not only the potentially ever-changing nature of historical study but the real dangers of historians allowing some gaps to remain unfilled. By contrast, where gaps in knowledge exist in fictional works they have nothing like the same impact even though they may be impossible to fill. Doložel cites the example of *Macbeth*; no amount of textual analysis will yield whether Lady Macbeth had children because Shakespeare simply did not provide the information in his drama.

Doložel is happy to say the boundary between fiction and history is open but “possible worlds semantics is curious about what happens when the boundaries are crossed” (264) and points to three well-known border-crossings: historical fiction, counterfactual history and what Doložel, echoing Genette, terms “factual narrative.” Writers of historical fiction, for instance, can include representations of both actual and fictional characters but fictional characters cannot exist in the actual world. Factual narrative is “the most remarkable manifestation of the open boundary between fiction and history” (267) because the possible worlds of factual narrative are “models of witnessed present” but its mode is “fictional” (268). Questions can be asked about the factuality of factual narrative but they can be explained by the practitioner's “skilful and patient reporting” and where that is shown to have failed, the work has violated the norms of its genre and can be reclassified as fiction (268-69). The question of exactly how works of book-length journalism are shown to have failed may be more complicated than Doložel allows, but that will be dealt with in the following chapter.

A clearer sense of the boundaries between fiction and fact enables us to apply White's argument about emplotment more productively. Where Ryan takes from White the notion that rhetorical techniques are present in non-fiction as well as fiction, I turn to the research phase in works of fiction and non-fiction. However much factual material is included in a work of fiction it remains primarily a work of invention. That is, following Doložel, authors invent plots for their novels. A

practitioner of book-length journalism cannot – or should not – invent a plot for the subject of their work. White is right to point out that some historians (and journalists) do impose plots on their raw material; that is at least partly what I am arguing about both *The Final Days* and *In Cold Blood*. As Harrington writes:

To keep ourselves open to what is before us, we must not become too obsessed with asking ourselves, ‘What’s the story here?’ – and thus fall victim to the reporter’s paranoia that we’ve got to produce something out of this mess and we better figure it out fast. That undermines our ability to grasp the story, because it means we’ll inevitably fall back on well-worn themes and observations – interpretive clichés – and not give ourselves the time or frame of mind to see anything beyond that (“A Writer’s Essay” *Intimate Journalism* xxxiv).

Many of the most engaging works of book-length journalism are imbued with a well-deep sense of curiosity about the world and its people; intellectually, and emotionally, a long distance has been travelled by the practitioner from their original idea via their research to the final argument. As Simons says: “If you go through the entire process of writing a book without having changed your mind on anything then my instinct would be to question whether you really engaged in the process. You should be surprised by your material (Personal interview).

Eric Heyne and Lehman have made significant contributions to developing a theoretical underpinning for literary non-fiction that applies to book-length journalism. Heyne begins by flatly rejecting as grandiose assertions that there is no difference between fact and fiction and argues for core differences between fiction and literary non-fiction that need to be recognized by “any theory that hopes to do justice to powerful nonfiction narratives” (“Toward a Theory of Literary Nonfiction” 480). Drawing on John Searle’s work that the distinction we commonly make between factual and fictional statements derives not from the statements themselves but our perception of the type of statement being intended, Heyne argues it is the author who decides whether a book is fact or fiction and it is left to the reader to determine whether the book contains good or bad fact. He uses the terms “factual status” and “factual adequacy” respectively to distinguish between these two kinds of

truth. Heyne acknowledges there is no “transcendent connection between space/time events and narrative of those events” but “recognizing we are students of human constructions shaped by human purposes need not make us afraid to talk about truth. We make decisions every day based on our evaluations of competing versions of reality” (489). Lehman, in his book *Matters of Fact*, agrees with much of Heyne’s argument. “The confession that, finally, it is impossible to delineate an exact boundary between fiction and nonfiction does not mean that the boundary does not matter” (5).

Lehman builds on Heyne’s binary model of factual status and factual adequacy by setting up the four way framework that was discussed in chapter one. He uses the term “implicated” to describe the complex strands of relationships inherent in non-fiction between, on the one hand, journalists, the events they write about and the texts they produce, and on the other, readers, their knowledge of the events written about, and their engagement with the text (*Matters of Fact* 36). The relationship between journalist and reader operates differently in non-fiction to fiction because of the overt and claimed relationship between the book and actual people and events. Lehman openly acknowledges there is no simple equation between actuality and non-fiction or even actuality and fictional texts; even if such an equation was possible the “genre police” (*Matters of Fact* 5) as he calls them would need to account for the existence of narratives in an “intertextual milieu” that make the relationship between actuality and its reproduction almost indistinguishable (7). Even so, the decision by an author or the publisher to label a book non-fiction remains an important key to how it is written and read. Heyne, in a second journal article, concedes his binary model is oversimplified, then develops Lehman’s work by offering a mental map for discerning the relationship between fiction and non-fiction:

One way to recognize the kind of narrative truth that we associate with nonfiction is by the presence of a certain kind of caring. If the reader is prepared to assert an alternative version of events, to engage actively in a certain kind of dialogue, then we are dealing with something we might all be willing to call non-fiction.... When we can talk about different stories competing, and when we genuinely wish to choose among them rather than allowing them to peacefully coexist,

then we have left the realm of fiction (“Where Fiction Meets Nonfiction” 330).

This is a particularly helpful switching-point for discerning readers’ differing responses to fiction and book-length journalism. It illuminates an aspect of the public response to Garner’s *The First Stone*, for instance. As discussed in chapter three, a minority read the book as fiction, and Garner used pseudonyms but overwhelmingly readers and critics read the book as non-fiction and passionately argued about the events at Ormond College and Garner’s interpretation of them.

If some scholars such as White confuse fiction with literariness, others conflate fiction with narrative. No less a theoretical figure than Genette notes in 1991 that narrative studies has focused “almost exclusively on fictional narrative alone” acting as if there is “an implicit privilege that hypostatizes fictional narrative into narrative par excellence, or into a model for all narratives” (*Fiction & Diction* 54-55). Such has been the emphasis in narrative studies on fiction that he believes his work *Narrative Discourse Revisited* ought to have been retitled “a restricted narratology” (*Fiction & Diction* 56). Genette uses the framework he developed in his earlier work *Narrative Discourse* to compare fiction with what he terms “factual narrative,” which provides valuable insights into, for instance, the danger of using an omniscient narrative voice in factual narrative that will be applied later in this chapter, but he acknowledges he has not done the “empirical investigation that remains eminently necessary in this arena” (*Fiction & Diction* 54-84, ix). Genette’s unfamiliarity with the range and history of journalism prompts him to discuss the “indexes of fictionality” in the opening of an article published in *The New Yorker* in 1988 as if such an anecdotal lead, as it is known in the media industry, is noteworthy rather than a commonplace not just at the magazine since at least the 1930s (Yagoda *About Town* 137) but a common practice in newspapers as well as magazines for decades both in the United States and Australia (Blundell *The Art and Craft of Feature Writing* 131-36; Ricketson *Writing Feature Stories* 175-77). Not that Genette is alone; as Stephens comments, too often journalism historians “seem like theater historians who have never studied Shakespeare or Sophocles” (*A History of News* 1)

Where the conflating of the words fiction and narrative plays out in discussions of book-length journalism is in the belief that one of the defining elements of book-

length journalism (and the other terms such as literary journalism) is the application of fictional techniques to writing about actual people and events (Wolfe and Johnson *The New Journalism* 46; Murphy, *The New Journalism: A Critical Perspective* 17; Sims *The Literary Journalists* 5; Lounsberry and Talese *The Literature of Fact* 29-31). I have used the term myself (“True Stories” 150; *Writing Feature Stories* 228), but now believe it is misleading, for two reasons. First, the word “technique” connotes the simple plucking of techniques from the writer’s tool-box and applying them to a set of facts. Following this line of thought can lead practitioners to view research and writing as separate and distinct processes rather than organically linked to each other. Second, and more important, implicit in using the words fictional techniques is a reaction against the dominant way people and events are presented in the print media, especially newspapers; that is, in news reports. The reaction is not altogether surprising as the news report, with its fixed format and formal tone, has been the predominant print media form since near the end of the nineteenth century (Mindich *Just the Facts* 64-94; Schudson, *The Power of News* 59-60). So familiar are its conventions that it has been satirized since at least 1965 when a former journalist, Michael Frayn, wrote his novel *The Tin Man* (57-61). Such familiarity invites the belief that the news report is a naturally occurring phenomenon but it is actually the result of a complex history that includes but is not limited to: the unreliability of the early telegraph that impelled journalists to send the most critical piece of information first in their dispatches, and the rapid expansion of newspapers that gave rise to a journalistic class. Previously, most publishers had used newspapers to express their partisan political views; they did not want to grant their employed journalists similar freedom, which led in turn to development of a mode of writing that sought to erase the identity and ideology of the journalist and present the world dispassionately (Schudson *Discovering the News* 61-87; Stephens *A History of News* 214-262; Mindich *Just the Facts* 64-94).

It may be more productive, though, to see this area of writing not only as a reaction against the rigid form of news reporting, but to look before the rise of the inverted pyramid. What this shows is while all forms of writing are an abstraction from the reality they seek to describe, the hard news report is, more than many, a circumscribed form of writing. News reports do not offer analysis, they do not set events in context and they exclude atmosphere and emotion, or where they do report

atmosphere and emotion they snap-freeze them in phrases such as “visibly upset.” In Mailer’s memorable phrase they are forever “munching nuance like peanuts” (Stephens *A History of News* 242). The limitations of the hard news report, as Carey suggests, are a key driver behind the continued existence of other journalistic forms (“Dark Continent” 151). Before the rise of the hard news report in second half of the nineteenth century, daily newspapers presented their reports in a variety of forms written in a variety of narrative modes. In 1836 James Gordon Bennett, editor of *The New York Herald*, pioneered the eyewitness true crime report when he wrote about his viewing of the “beautiful female corpse” of a murdered twenty-three year old prostitute in the city “that surpassed the finest statue of antiquity” and drawing on his sources recreated the death from the moment the murderer “drew from beneath his cloak the hatchet” (Stephens 231). It was common then for newspapers to present their reports in the form of a chronological narrative. On 8 December 1854 *The Age* newspaper in Melbourne, Australia, began its report on war in the Crimea as follows: “To render the narrative of events clear to our distant readers, we must trace it from its commencement” (Hutton and Tanner *125 Years of Age* 5-6). Schudson studied the historical development of the coverage of the American president’s state of the union address, from 1790 to the twentieth century. By the mid nineteenth century it was common for newspapers to reprint the president’s address in full, accompanied by an editorial commentary that was written from “an engaged and partisan stance,” and a news report about the “spectacle” of the opening of Congress (*The Power of News* 57). *The New York Times* began its report in 1870: “A beautiful Indian summer sun, a balmy atmosphere, and crowded galleries, resplendent and brilliant hues of gay toilettes, greeted the return of the Congress to its chambers” (57-58).

What emerges from this historical context are three points relevant to this thesis: first, the use of the hard news report has never been the sole form in which news has been presented; second, the use of a range of modes of writing usually associated with fiction are not the sole province of fiction, and third, the use of the word fiction in the term fictional techniques sends a misleading message to practitioners and critics alike because the word fiction is, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, “that which is feigned or invented; invention as opposed to fact.” Granting that the line between fact and invention is nowhere near as neatly drawn as lexicographers would have us believe, using the word fiction flies in the face of what practitioners,

including Boynton's interviewees and the Australian practitioners interviewed for this thesis, believe they are doing. As Tracy Kidder, winner of a Pulitzer prize for general non-fiction, says the techniques of fiction writing never belonged to fiction: "They belong to storytelling" (Sims and Kramer *Literary Journalism* 19). A partial exception to this consensus is Blackburn whose description of her "fictionalizing" of parts of her book *Broken Lives* is closer to a mechanistic than an organic approach ("Finding Narrative Form"). It is preferable, then, to see that what journalists do, whether working in newspapers, magazines or at book-length, as drawing on a range of narrative approaches to research and write about actual as distinct from invented people, events and issues.

An important corollary of this re-orientation is that it allows us to focus on how ethical issues arise when book-length journalism is written in a particular narrative mode; the question of how well the book is written is secondary. That is, if a work of book-length journalism is superbly written would that mitigate or eliminate the ethical issues? It could be argued that a superbly written work would intensify the ethical issue as it would lodge deeper in the reader's consciousness. I do not want to argue there are fixed links between ethics in the narrative mode and levels of literary skill as that connotes a mechanistic relationship between them, whereas the act of researching and writing is an organic as well as a mechanical process. It is possible for a practitioner to be a gifted wordsmith and an unethical journalist and, too, for the reverse to hold. It is possible that more complex interrelationships exist between any given practitioner's literary ability and their practice of ethical decision-making; that question is beyond the scope of this thesis. The key point here is that the ethical issue is triggered by the taking of a particular narrative approach, and that this ethical issue in the practice of book-length journalism needs our attention before, or at the very least alongside, attending to literary issues.

In the writing phase of producing book-length journalism, practitioners need to find a balance between their desire to write in a narrative mode that deeply engages readers' emotions and one that engages readers' minds as well as their emotions. The former runs the risk of sensationalism; the latter more faithfully reflects people and events in their complexity. Whichever approach the practitioner favours, their work needs to be underpinned by a commitment to veracity. The demands of balancing these goals exist in a range of journalistic practices such as the use of quotations, but

they show up most sharply in how practitioners present their narrative voice, how they describe people and when they reconstruct events as scenes. Practitioners need to consider whether some narrative methods are unavailable or unsuitable to book-length journalism, such as trying to convey their sources' thoughts and feelings in interior monologues. These issues will be discussed by continuing my investigation of *In Cold Blood* and *The Final Days* and through reflections by leading practitioners in the United States and to a lesser extent, Australia.

The first choice to be made by practitioners who write primarily in the narrative mode is whether they make claims to represent events and people as they are or draw attention to the impossibility or, at least, the difficulty of doing this. David Eason's framework for analysing representation in the New Journalism is relevant to book-length journalism. He proposes two main approaches; the first he terms realist, the second modernist ("The New Journalism and the Image-World" 191-205). The first approach claims to represent reality as it is, the second draws attention to the inherent difficulty of this task, and makes clear to the reader that the meaning of events is constructed by both journalist and reader. He argues Talese, Wolfe and Capote take the realist approach while Didion, Mailer and Thompson take the modernist approach. The former group acknowledges that "reality, though elusive, nonetheless waits to be discovered" (192), which they achieve by immersing themselves in their subjects' worlds and writing in a narrative mode about what they found. The second group believes image and reality in the world are so intertwined as to entangle common understandings. The modernists write in a narrative mode to "call attention to storytelling as a cultural practice for making a common world" (193)

Eason links practitioners' approach to representation with their approach to research and argues that where realists describe their firsthand observation as a professional act that poses "only manageable ethical problems," modernists explicitly examine such assumptions. In this context Eason cites Wolfe's breezy caution against becoming close to his principal sources discussed earlier, concluding that for realists a clear distinction must be maintained between observer and observed. In contrast, he cites John Gregory Dunne's *Vegas: A Memoir of a Dark Season*, published in 1974, that began as a conventional realist attempt to write about the underside of Las Vegas through the lives of a prostitute who attends beauty school by day, a private detective and a small-time comic but becomes a questioning of his own voyeurism, which

Dunne decides is sanctioned by the apparatus surrounding realist journalism (198). Eason does not argue his binary framework covers all New Journalists. While valuable, it is overly schematic. For a start, Eason's framework draws too neat a line between the approach practitioners take in representing people and events and how they engaged with them during their research. For instance, Malcolm's *The Journalist and the Murderer* is a modernist text by Eason's framework but, as argued in the previous chapter, she distorts certain key events in the *Fatal Vision* case, and she appears unable to conceive of the journalist-source beyond either a pattern of seduction and betrayal or disengagement from the source. Conversely, *Random Family* is presented as a realist text yet the available evidence suggests LeBlanc went to great lengths to respect the humanity of the principal sources she worked with over eleven years (Boynton 227-47; Kelliher "Ties That Bind" 40-43).

Eason does not appear to allow for the possibility of a practitioner being fully alive to the difficulties of representing events and people yet choosing to present their findings in a realist narrative mode. Conversely, a practitioner's self-conscious demonstrating of the difficulties of representation can have the effect of obscuring the subject or, consciously or otherwise, of foreclosing their inquiry. How a practitioner of book-length journalism chooses to represent events and people and issues, then, is not a failsafe guide to how they researched their topic or even necessarily of their worldview. It does follow, though, that a reader (or a critic) will draw conclusions from the book with or without the benefit of knowledge about how it was researched, and this should prompt practitioners to reflect on how they represent their topics. Conceiving of book-length journalism existing along a continuum rather than a binary framework, it can be seen that realist texts sitting near one end of the continuum ask for greater trust from readers and have fewer ways of signaling that they offer one version of events rather than an inviolable truth. At the other end, modernist texts make clear the limits of representation but that is a first step, not the final word. What happens if the practitioner's narrative voice so dominates the book that it squeezes out alternative perspectives?

Eason's framework is relevant and useful, though, for discussing Woodward's realist texts. Woodward began writing books drawing on his reporting work at *The Washington Post* and nearing four decades later, Woodward is still on the newspaper's staff; apart from an agreed number of weekends when he edits the

Sunday edition, however, he works primarily from a home office (Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 204). Woodward does give his newspaper first right to publish anything from a coming book, for US\$1, and he does contribute articles but effectively Woodward receives a full-time salary to research and write book-length journalism, an arrangement that is rare, if not unique (Shepard 243-245). The ethical issue Woodward created in the research phase of his work – his use of anonymous sources – continues in the writing phase. Where Woodward and Bernstein used anonymous sources in *All the President's Men*, there are two important differences between their first book and Woodward's later work, beginning with *The Final Days*. First, Deep Throat, the gold standard among anonymous sources, is central to the first book but absent from the second, both as a source for Woodward and in the book itself (*The Secret Man* 102, 118). Second, the former book is their account of how they unearthed the political dirty tricks campaign orchestrated by President Nixon and his senior aides. It rarely goes beyond their field of vision, and the two young reporters show a willingness to write about and, to a limited degree, reflect on how they went about their work (*All the President's Men* 35-36, 39, 63, 95, 120, 193, 207-10, 224-25 and 287-88). Woodward and Bernstein resolved the question of co-authorship by presenting themselves in the third person, using only their surnames and allowing some self-deprecating humour. Bernstein, for instance, relayed the office rumour that "English was not Woodward's native language" (14-15).

Where *All the President's Men* is narrated through the journalists' eyes, in the latter book, they absented themselves as an overt narrative presence. Both practitioners' names are on the title page but, as mentioned in chapter one, Bernstein's contribution amounted to twenty-five per cent (Havill *Deep Truth* 110) and for this and other reasons outlined earlier I am focusing on Woodward. Newspaper journalists such as Woodward have been trained in a writing style that emphasizes the importance of the subject-matter, not the journalist's subjectivity. It is common for textbooks to advise journalists to keep themselves out of their articles unless they believe their overt presence will add something useful; I have written such advice myself (*Writing Feature Stories* 187-188). It has been dispensed in newsrooms since at least the 1950s when E.B. White's essay "An Approach to Style" was added to a new edition of William Strunk's *The Elements of Style*: "To achieve style, begin by affecting none – that is, place yourself in the background. A careful and honest writer does not

need to worry about style. As he becomes proficient in the use of language, his style will emerge, because he himself will emerge” (59). The goal of what Strunk called the “plain English style” was solely to serve the meaning of the intended communication and to leave no trace of an individual voice. “One measure of this doctrine’s weirdness,” observes Yagoda, “is its absolute inapplicability to E. B. White’s own prose style, which, although outwardly plain, simple, orderly, and sincere, is also idiosyncratic, opinionated, and unmistakable” (*The Sound on the Page* xx). Yagoda, and other critics (Kenner “The Politics of the Plain Style” 183-190), are alive to what can be hidden beneath the transparent style, though Yagoda is also attuned to the virtues in prose of clarity and simplicity.

Despite the illusion and even intent of transparency in the plain prose style, the journalist’s choice of narrative voice is not a neutral one. In *The Final Days* Woodward blends the plain style with a seemingly omniscient narrative voice, which appears to have been influenced by the success of Theodore White’s series of works of book-length journalism about presidential election campaigns, beginning in 1960. Before White, campaign coverage was perfunctory and superficial but he decided to present it “in novelistic terms, with generous helpings of colorful detail to sugar the political analysis,” as Timothy Crouse writes in his work of book-length journalism about coverage of the 1972 campaign, *The Boys on the Bus* (36), that is also a pathfinding piece of media criticism (Dunn “*Rolling Stone’s* Coverage of the 1972 U.S. Presidential Election” 33). White said that for a book about politics to succeed it “must have a unity, a dramatic unfolding from a single central theme so that the reader comes away from the book as if he had participated himself in the development of a wonder” (Hoffman *Theodore H. White* 110). Through White, readers saw their candidates afresh, which catapulted *The Making of the President* series to the bestseller lists (Appendix A). By the 1970s White’s innovation had curdled into mythologizing candidates and downplaying events that were anything but “the development of a wonder” such as the Watergate cover-up. (Hoffman *Theodore H. White* 181). As the radical journalist I.F. Stone comments in a review of one of White’s books: “A writer who can be so universally admiring need never lunch alone” (*In a Time of Torment* 63).

The use of an omniscient narrative voice in *The Final Days* has troubling results, as it had in White’s books, though Woodward’s problem – initially at least – was not

that he mythologized politicians. The book opens with a reconstructed scene of two presidential aides, Fred Buzhardt and Len Garment, travelling by air to Miami on 3 November 1973 to advise Nixon to resign and ends on 9 August 1974 when it actually happens. The reader is positioned in the book as if they were on board the aeroplane watching Buzhardt tap his hand on the armrest (22) and as if they were inside the White House watching as aides and politicians, including the president, discuss how to deal with the enveloping crisis. Much of the narrative mode's impact derives from the events it describes rather than any particular skill in the writing. Think of it this way; if *The Final Days* concerned the demise of the state manager of a life insurance firm, it is hard to imagine it winning many readers. This is not a trite point, for two reasons; first, several successful works of book-length journalism have been written about apparently mundane subjects, such as Kidder's book-length accounts of building a house, *House*, and a year spent sitting in a primary school classroom, *Among Schoolchildren*. Second, the ethical issues in Woodward's writing phase arise in the initial taking of a narrative approach. *The Final Days* is written in a doggedly single-paced, monotonal narrative mode. For instance, Nixon's trip to his barber before his resignation is accompanied by a short history of presidential hair care, beginning with Milton Pitts telling Nixon:

‘I can improve your hair very much by shampooing first, then blending the hair with a razor and using a hot-air drier on it. That will give your hair a softer, more natural look and straighten it some.’ The President's steel-gray hair was a bit oily and curly and had a shiny look even though it was healthy and free of dandruff. The President told Pitts to go ahead. Within two weeks *Time* magazine had sent a reporter to find out why Nixon's hair looked so much better (428)

Perhaps these details were intended to humanize Nixon but the wooden language and flat declarative sentences read like an unintentional parody of the 1950s television police procedural *Dragnet*. “The problem with Woodward is that he cannot write to save himself,” comments Marr, “and his achievement in the light of that is heroic” (Personal interview).

The quality of Woodward's prose often goes unremarked because the people in *The Final Days*, and most of his other books, occupy important national positions; any

representation of them beyond their public roles immediately takes on an intensified level of intimacy for the reader. Some material shocked readers and reviewers when the book was published in 1976 (Havill 110-12; Shepard 142-49). The incidents most commented upon were the contention that Nixon and his wife Pat no longer shared a bed and she had “rejected his advances” since the early 1960s (*The Final Days* 165-66) and Nixon’s deterioration; he is often shown drinking heavily (103-4, 395, 424), wondering aloud to his chief of staff Alexander Haig whether he should follow military protocol and kill himself (403) and, finally, his tumultuous three hour meeting with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger the night before his resignation where the two men are reported to pray together in the Lincoln Sitting Room (422). Nixon broke down and began thumping the carpet with his fist, saying “What have I done? What has happened?” He lay “curled on the carpet like a child” while Kissinger tried to reassure him about his accomplishments as president. (424). Woodward and Bernstein had not observed these dramatic moments for themselves but relied on anonymous sources to reconstruct the scenes. In a foreword they write that they interviewed one or more participants in meetings they describe and resolved differences in various people’s accounts by re-interviewing. Where they were unable to talk to any of the people who participated in particular meetings, they rely on accounts from those who spoke to the participants immediately afterward. “Nothing in this book has been reconstructed without accounts from at least two people” they write but acknowledge that they were unable to interview the president (12-13). That is hardly surprising considering the anguish their disclosures had caused him, but what is alarming is the gulf between the narrative tone, which through 435 pages implicitly tells the reader this is *exactly* how events unfolded, and the reliance not just on anonymous sources but on second hand accounts of volatile meetings.

Only Kissinger and Nixon were present in the Lincoln Sitting Room and the journalists admit Nixon did not speak to them. The source, then, had to be Kissinger or those he spoke to immediately afterward. Even if the journalists heard accounts from two members of Kissinger’s staff, as is suggested in the book (424), they are two accounts of one person’s recollection of a meeting. They are also second hand accounts, meaning they do not know what Kissinger may have omitted or exaggerated or misrepresented.

Shepard quotes Woodward and Bernstein saying their account was confirmed later when Kissinger and Nixon published their memoirs (147). She also quotes Kissinger from a contemporaneous television interview saying he believed the book was “essentially accurate” even if their reporting of Nixon’s breakdown showed “an indecent lack of compassion” (147). Havill writes that Nixon and Kissinger may have included their praying together in their respective memoirs but both denied Nixon pounding the carpet and quotations attributed to him. Kissinger’s two staff members also denied that Kissinger had described the scene to them (*Deep Truth* 201; Emery *Watergate* 474). In his memoirs Nixon describes himself inviting Kissinger to kneel and pray with him and acknowledges that he “found himself more emotional than I had been at any time since the decision [to resign] had been put in train” (*Memoirs* 1076). In his memoirs, Kissinger confirms the gist of the account but describes it as “unfeeling” and denies Nixon beat the carpet (*Years of Upheaval* 1207-1210). A later biography of Kissinger that drew on interviews with Nixon, Kissinger, Scowcroft and Eagleburger confirmed the essence of the journalists’ version but rejected the detail of Nixon pounding the carpet (*Kissinger* 597-600, 816 note 8)

Where a newspaper editor could be satisfied with that level of accuracy, a work of book-length journalism that has been researched for six months with the aid of two full-time researchers (Shepard 125-26) aspires to a higher level of accuracy, especially when it is presented in a narrative mode that invites readers to believe they are being taken into high-level private meetings. By comparison, another practitioner of book-length journalism, J. Anthony Lukas, published a book in the same year on the same subject that included a briefer and less dramatic account of the Nixon-Kissinger meeting: “they talked of their past triumphs and diverging futures” (*Nightmare* 565). Lukas, who later won a Pulitzer prize for general non-fiction for another book (See Appendix D), reports stories of Nixon’s erratic, disconnected behaviour as his presidency unravelled but writes: “There were other stories, stranger yet, which one is reluctant to report because they are so difficult to confirm” (562). These may well be the same stories Woodward and his researchers were hearing; the difference is Woodward chose to publish them. Practitioners writing in a narrative mode commonly gather material about how people look, feel and behave, especially

at critical moments in their lives, so that is not the prime concern with Woodward's practice.

Four ethical issues arise in Woodward's representation of people and events: first, as discussed in the previous chapter he relies for these intimate details on anonymous sources who may well be trying to manipulate him. Second, there is a persistent stream of criticism in the literature about Woodward that he embellishes or even invents details to enliven his narrative mode, beginning with *All the President's Men* where "conveniently metaphoric" weather matches the state of the journalists' investigations but not the actual weather records (Havill 85-87). Steven Brill, publisher of the now defunct media watchdog magazine, *Brill's Content*, raised similar questions about a later Woodward book that he and Woodward trenchantly debated over eleven pages of the September and November 1999 issues. Woodward was widely accused – and vehemently denied – inventing a hospital visit he made to a seriously ill William Casey, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, for his book *Veil* (Havill 182-95; Shepard 232-35). Woodward also has strong defenders, including Shepard and David Greenberg, who worked as a research assistant to Woodward on *The Agenda: Inside the Clinton White House*, and who has written an original, thoughtful book entitled *Nixon's Shadow: The History of an Image*. He argues *The Final Days* is grounded in careful research, drawing on a much wider range of sources than Woodward's oft-noted reliance on Deep Throat suggests. Greenberg looked at some of Woodward and Bernstein's original notes in the Harry Ransom Center and found they "hewed strictly to what the sources recalled" ("Beyond Deep Throat" 52). The debate about whether Woodward embellishes or invents details has not been won by either side but nor has it been laid to rest, which is worrying for a journalist of such high reputation. The third issue is that Woodward writes about events and people of national importance engaged in controversial events where every action and word is contested. Jack Fuller, a newspaper publisher, Pulitzer prize-winning journalist and author of five novels, questions Woodward's practice on this ground: "It is one thing to infer certain feelings in a warm and flattering account of a father's pride at watching his son pitch his first professional baseball game and another to attempt to guess at what went through a policeman's mind as he fired a shot that killed an innocent boy" ("News and Literary Technique" 153).

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, Woodward presents his findings through the prism of an omniscient narrative voice. In narrative studies this once neutral term has been picked apart to reveal its underlying assumption that authors literally know everything about their fictional universe, that they can direct their reader in any way they see fit and that readers will obey rather than actively interpret the narrator's work (H. Porter Abbott 66, 194). This re-evaluation has profound implications for both practitioners and readers of book-length journalism. Genette describes omniscient narration in factual narrative as even more "disrespectful" than in fiction "since in quantitative terms it is less likely that an author would know the thoughts of all the characters than those of a single one" (*Fiction and Diction* 67). If authors are not quite the masters of their fictional universes they imagined, journalists certainly are not. Returning to the Nixon/Kissinger meeting with this in mind, the ethical issue is clear. The reader is positioned inside the Lincoln Sitting Room as if they could watch events unfold on a critical night in American history. That is its power; it is also its transgression. Even if Nixon and Kissinger did say the words attributed to them in *The Final Days* – and that is contested – the scene is presented as if it is the only possible version of events. Lukas' *Nightmare* again offers a useful counterpoint. When he recounts recalled dialogue between, for instance Alexander Haig and Casper Weinberger, he writes that it "went something like this" (548), gently reminding the reader that they are being offered one person's reconstruction. It is not clear whether Woodward initiated the omniscient narrative voice, but there is evidence the book's editor, Alice Mayhew, encouraged and enforced it. She comments on one draft that events were being narrated through the journalists' eyes. "We should never see that. Always must be through somebody else: Eagleburger, Scowcroft, Haig, Garment, etc" (Shepard 129). Regardless of its origins and despite the ethical problem it creates, omniscient narration has remained a staple of Woodward's book-length journalism.

The lack of public accountability for Woodward's anonymous sources has masked a shift in the nature and range of his sources over his career. Where *All the President's Men* and *The Final Days* are the work of young outsiders, in later books Woodward has become a Washington insider according to Shepard (235). Nixon did not talk to Woodward and Bernstein for their books, but later presidents have been interviewed, including Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter (*Shadow* 518) and George W. Bush (*Bush at*

War xii; *Plan of Attack* x). Where the first two Woodward books provide deeply unflattering portrayals of those in power, in later books Woodward persuades political leaders to talk because “essentially, I write self-portraits” (Didion “Political Pornography” 204). Mark Danner, an American journalism academic and author of *Torture and Truth: America, Abu Ghraib and the War on Terror*, has compared Woodward with another veteran investigative reporter and practitioner of book-length journalism, Seymour Hersh. Where Woodward relies for his disclosures on officials at the highest levels of government, Hersh’s sources come from lower levels of the government and intelligence bureaucracy. Where Woodward provides the “deeper” version of what is, essentially, “the official story,” Hersh unearths a version of events that “the government does *not* want public – which is to say, a version that contradicts the official story of what went on” (Sherman “The Avenger” 42).

Danner implies the public interest value of disclosures by Woodward is less than those by Hersh, but Didion has gone further, provocatively arguing that Woodward writes “political pornography” (“Political Pornography” 214). A longtime political essayist as well as a novelist and author of several works of book-length journalism, Didion is a modernist in Eason’s framework. To her, Woodward writes books “in which measurable cerebral activity is virtually absent” (194). That is, Woodward relentlessly accumulates quotidian details – what people eat, what they wear – but refuses to question the meaning of events or discuss the issues he is reporting. People within various administrations talk to Woodward not only because he grants them anonymity but because:

What they have in Mr Woodward is a widely trusted reporter, even an American icon, who can be relied upon to present a Washington in which problematic or questionable matters will be definitively resolved by the discovery, or by the demonstration that there can be no discovery, of ‘the smoking gun,’ ‘the evidence.’ Should such narrowly defined ‘evidence’ be found, he can then be relied upon to demonstrate, ‘fairly,’ that the only fingerprints on the smoking gun are those of the one bad apple in the barrel, the single rogue agent in the tapestry of good intentions (214)

Didion's essay was written during the Clinton presidency and reprinted in a book early in Bush's presidency. Hersh, a staff writer at *The New Yorker*, was the first print journalist to report on abuse of prisoners at the Abu Ghraib prison in Baghdad, in mid-2004; the revelation shocked people around the world and was denounced by the White House. By late 2006 Woodward had written three books about the Bush government that tacked closely to public perception of the presidency (Rich *The Greatest Story Ever Sold* 125-27). A fourth book, *The War Within*, was published at the end of 2008, too late for detailed consideration here. The first two books, *Bush at War*, published in 2002, and *Plan of Attack*, published two years later, were broadly favourable portraits of the administration; it was only in the third book, *State of Denial*, published in late 2006 after it had become clear to even the least interested citizens that the "War on Terror" had been poorly conceived and was being poorly executed, that Woodward meted out strong criticism. The giveaway, according to Jacob Weisberg, editor of online journal, *Slate*, could be discerned in Woodward's treatment of key administration figures, such as Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, who was shown as commanding, intense and incisive in the first two books but in the third as an arrogant micromanager loathed by staff and refusing to acknowledge the growing Iraqi insurgency. But Woodward, too, never acknowledges his changed perspective, writes Weisberg. "He can't say he's revising his judgments because he claims never to have made any. But, of course, Woodward does have a consistent worldview – the conventional wisdom of any given moment" ("The Decline of Rumsfeld" 4 October 2006). To Weisberg, the state of denial applied as much to Woodward as it did to the Bush administration.

Woodward's approach to writing in a narrative mode, then, shows the danger of trying to hermetically seal highly charged and contested events and people in his own non-fictional universe. Capote also attempts to remove himself from *In Cold Blood* as an overt narrative voice and his approach to representing people and events poses equally troubling issues, some similar to those faced by Woodward, some manifesting themselves differently. Comparing the two prompts the question: if the ethical issues in Woodward's writing phase arise in his taking a narrative approach, are these issues diminished or resolved in the narrative approach of a talented prose stylist such as Capote? Five main issues arise in the writing phase of *In Cold Blood*: Capote's avowedly omniscient narrative voice; the extent to which Capote relies on

reconstruction of scenes; the paucity of attribution of information; Capote's willingness to invent details and even scenes, and his distorting of evidence to match his artistic vision.

In Cold Blood is a considerably more sophisticated book than *The Final Days*, which is not surprising given Capote's background. Other practitioners before him, notably Hersey and Ross, had taken a narrative approach, but *In Cold Blood* significantly enlarged the scope of book-length journalism by exploring the extent to which such works could be developed so they read like a full-length socially realistic novel (Kerrane and Yagoda 161). Capote skilfully builds tension by using sequential narration, alternating scenes of the Clutter family with scenes of their two killers that overlap and propel the action of the book (Lounsberry and Talese 94). In the middle section, Capote not only alternates between the killers and their pursuing detectives but makes the scenes progressively shorter to develop suspense (Kerrane and Yagoda 161). Capote's writing continues to impress at least two of Boynton's interviewees, Kotlowitz (151) and Harr, who says that for *A Civil Action* he tried to imitate Capote's opening description of Holcomb, Kansas that is "so vivid and clean, with no characters other than the town itself" but despite re-reading the scene a dozen times "I didn't come close to him" (125).

Capote's literary talent is clear but does it solve the problem of an omniscient narrative voice in book-length journalism? How does Capote present the Clutters' final days when it was their deaths that sparked his interest in the case, and how can he report Smith and Hickock's time on the run when he had not yet met them? Capote's answer was that he interviewed numerous people in Holcomb about the Clutters and interviewed the murderers extensively and separately, cross-referencing their answers and only using material that they agreed on (Plimpton "The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel" 57-58). Sometimes Capote shows the source of his material indirectly, as when the Clutters' home telephone rings and the daughter who was killed, Nancy, answers it and speaks to a Mrs Katz, who Capote had interviewed (Nance *The Worlds of Truman Capote* 183). Sometimes he draws inferences from his material, as when the father, Herb Clutter, was showering and dressing in his own bedroom, and Capote writes "he had no fear of disturbing" his wife Bonny (*In Cold Blood* 6). The point of view is that of a dead man, but the inference Capote draws from his interviews is modest and evidence provided in the passage supports it. That

is, argues Fuller, the Clutters are reported to sleep in separate bedrooms and describing Clutter's state of mind here – “he had no fear of disturbing her” – is unremarkable (“News and Literary Technique” 146). Yagoda offers qualified support for Capote's reconstruction of Smith and Hickock's flight from the farmhouse, acknowledging Capote's extensive interviews but questioning any person's ability to recall exactly what they said years, months or even days beforehand. In the end, though, “it is indisputable that Capote, with his novelist's ear, heard what his characters *could* have said and transcribed it more faithfully than any journalist before or since” (Italics in original *The Art of Fact* 161).

The problem, though, as with *The Final Days*, is that *In Cold Blood* is presented as a seamless account of events, admitting of no alternative versions. Capote explicitly described his narrative persona as omniscient. “My narrator is always an observer. He's better the less he participates in the action. He is the omniscient eye. I always try to make him the object sitting there vibrating – seeing, observing” (Nance 184). Capote believed the success of a non-fiction novel depended on the author withdrawing his overt presence. “The I-I intrudes when it really shouldn't” (Nance 182-83). On a few occasions Capote represents himself in the book as “an acquaintance” (*In Cold Blood* 50) or an anonymous “journalist” (274) but said he did this only because he could not find another way of relating the material (Nance 184). Lawrence Weschler, author of eight works of book-length journalism, says he uses “I” in his work out of modesty and believes its absence signals the opposite. “*The New York Times* is megalomaniacal. They use the voice that says, ‘This is how it is.... The ‘I’ doesn't have to show up every five sentences... But there had better be an individual voice that says, ‘This is just one person's view, based on one series of experiences’” (Boynton 418). His comment is apt for both Woodward and Capote. The latter, despite his recognized literary talent, does not appear to have given much thought to the ethical problems of omniscient narration in non-fiction, or to alternative narrative approaches. There is little doubt Capote spent a lot of time and energy researching his subject. His and Harper Lee's research notes from their initial visit to Holcomb fill fourteen folders in a box in the Capote papers at the New York Public Library, which include, among other things, an eighteen page chronology of events for the day of the murder (Box 7, Folder 6) and Capote's hand-drawn maps of Smith and Hickock's time on the run (Box 7, Folder 8). There are at least seven

letters in Clarke's selection where Capote checks information with his sources, especially the detective leading the investigation, Alvin Dewey (*Too Brief a Treat* 280, 285, 313, 317, 326, 328, 367), and a longtime fact-checker assigned by *The New Yorker*, Sandy Campbell, described Capote as the most accurate writer he had worked with (Clarke *Capote* 350).

This is not to say Capote's research is beyond questioning, as was demonstrated in the previous chapter. The editor of *The New Yorker*, Shawn, wrote in the margin of the galley proofs of the first part to be serialized: "How know? No witnesses? General problem" and later "A device needed for author to account for his knowing what was said in private conversations" (Yagoda *About Town* 347). In his comprehensive history of the magazine, Yagoda writes that Shawn did not act on his qualms and suggests his hands may have been tied because Capote had already signed a book contract with Random House which was determined to release the long awaited work less than three months after it appeared in his magazine. Many years later, Shawn told his deputy editor, Charles McGrath, that he wished he had not published *In Cold Blood*, but did not elaborate (Yagoda 348). Lillian Ross, a writer for the magazine who for many years lived with Shawn even as he remained married to his wife, later wrote that neither she nor Shawn believed in journalists reconstructing scenes or writing interior monologues. When she listed her favorite writers for the magazine Capote was not included (Roberts "Lillian Ross" 232-34; Ross *Reporting Back* 11).

A friend of Capote's, Donald Windham, writes in his memoir: "*In Cold Blood* couldn't be and wasn't published until Dick [Hickock] and Perry [Smith] were dead. When the book came out, the only living authority for the factualness of much of the narrative was Truman himself. It was the perfect set up for this kind of invention" (*Lost Friends* 79). Smith and Hickock sent hundreds of letters to Capote between 1960 and 1965, some of which were used in Clarke's biography and a small number (three) were reprinted in Clarke's selection of Capote's letters (*Too Brief a Treat* 386-87, 390, 412-13). As mentioned in the previous chapter, Smith and Hickock were concerned that they would be presented in Capote's book as "psychopathic killers" (Clarke *Capote* 346). This was largely special pleading on their part, and it is legitimate, even necessary, for a journalist to go beyond a single source's version and present an event in its complexity, but Capote oscillated between gaining the trust of

his principal sources and treating them as if they were characters in a fictional universe of his own making. Capote did exhaustive research, then, but he did not always follow where his research led, and it is in deviating from his research that Capote invented details and distorted material in ways that seriously undermine the credibility of his work as book-length journalism.

Capote had difficulty expunging his overt presence from his book when he had interviewed so extensively and observed numerous events first hand. In June 1960 he discussed this problem, which he described as “a technical one,” in a letter to Donald Cullivan, a former army acquaintance of Smith, to whom Smith had confessed the murders. Capote writes that he wanted to move conversations he and Smith had had about the murders to a scene between Smith and Cullivan (*Too Brief a Treat* 286). Cullivan apparently agreed because such a scene is included in the book (237-40). Capote’s problem was ethical rather than technical as he gave readers no clues as to what he had done but at least he was transposing the substance of statements he too had been told. In another letter, dated 16 August 1961, to Alvin and Marie Dewey, he asked if she could recall for him when and how Dewey had first mentioned Smith and Hickock. “I want to do this as a ‘scene’ between you and Alvin. Can you remember anything more about it (not that I mind inventing details, as you will see!)” (Underline in original *Too Brief a Treat* 326). At this point Capote’s habitual impulse to write fiction irretrievably begins to muddy his stated purpose of writing a factually accurate account of the Kansas murders. His letters do not reveal which details he invented; perhaps he was referring to the Smith-Cullivan transposed scene, or maybe to the ending of the book, which was entirely invented according to Clarke, who writes that Capote felt uneasy ending with the killers’ executions and opted for a happier scene showing Dewey meeting one of Nancy Clutter’s girlfriends in the local cemetery and conveying the message: life continues even amid death. It almost replicated the ending of *The Grass Harp*, a Capote novel published in 1951. “But what works in *The Grass Harp*, which is a kind of fantasy, works less well in a book of uncompromising realism like *In Cold Blood*, and that nostalgic meeting in the graveyard verges on the trite and sentimental” (*Capote* 359).

A number of contemporary critics noted similarities between Capote’s fiction and his book-length journalism, especially in the portrayal of Smith, who was “a dreamer, an androgynous father-seeker” like Joel Knox in *Other Voices, Other Rooms*, Capote’s

first published novel and, like Holly Golightly in *Breakfast at Tiffany's*, the maker of his own morality (De Bellis "Visions and Revisions" 533). Many characters in Capote's fiction are victims and Smith becomes, according to another critic, Robert Morris, "the total symbol for the exile, the alienated human being, the grotesque, the outsider, the quester after love, the sometimes sapient, sometimes innocent, sometimes evil child" (De Bellis 534). These critics may want to read *In Cold Blood* in the context of Capote's fictional oeuvre, but for a critic of book-length journalism the relevant question is, how does Capote's representation of Smith correspond to the person? It is conceivable, and perhaps inevitable, that there are patterns in how novelists create their fictional worlds and that these patterns may translate to their non-fiction. A practitioner of book-length journalism, though, like an historian or biographer, needs to enact the virtue of truthfulness and report what they have found in their research. Smith is more vividly presented than any other person in the book. Mailer went so far as to describe Smith as one of the "great characters in American literature" (Long "In Cold Comfort" 128). It does not appear he was being ironic, as there was much he admired about *In Cold Blood* and used it partly as a model for his "true life story" *The Executioner's Song*. But I would argue that the term character belongs to novels. For critics to talk of characters in book-length journalism unhelpfully blurs the relationship between fiction and reality; practitioners speaking of their "characters" connotes an inappropriate sense of ownership. Whatever the limitations of representation as an activity, that is what is being attempted – one journalist's representation of a person in a book. To put it another way, it would sound odd to talk of Richard Nixon as a "character" in *The Final Days*, and when journalists write books about, say, indigenous people, most critics are alive to the possibilities of these people's lives and stories being "appropriated."

Phillip K. Tompkins investigated the accuracy of *In Cold Blood* for the June 1966 issue of *Esquire* magazine, as mentioned in chapter one. What is relevant here is Tompkins' comparison of the book with the court record and his interviews with people involved in the case that show how Capote distorted his portrait of Smith to make him look more like a victim whose considerable potential was crippled by a miserable childhood. The undersheriff and his wife, Mr and Mrs Wendle Meier, told Tompkins that they had never heard Smith crying in his cell as Capote describes ("In Cold Fact" 168); nor did Smith ever say to Mrs Meier "I'm embraced by shame" (*In*

Cold Blood 254). Capote reported Smith apologizing at the gallows for his crime (281-82), but two newspaper reporters who attended the executions told Tompkins he did not apologise (“In Cold Fact” 168). Nor did Capote see Smith’s execution, according to Tompkins and others quoted in Plimpton’s oral biography of Capote (“In Cold Fact” 168; Plimpton *Truman Capote* 188-89). Most damaging for Capote, though, is Tompkins’ comparison between the transcript of Smith’s confession, the police testimony in court about the confession and Capote’s reporting of Smith’s confession as narrated to detectives in the book (190-203). Capote’s account is contradicted on a number of factual details, such as which question prompted Smith to begin confessing and whether Smith and the detectives were travelling in a car in front or behind the car in which Hickock was being driven. More importantly, Capote’s account is contradicted on the extent to which Smith could be held personally responsible for his actions. Capote has Smith saying when he began killing Mr Clutter “But I didn’t realize what I’d done till I heard the sound. Like somebody drowning. Screaming under water” (*In Cold Blood* 202). Conversely, Dewey testified that Smith and Hickock told him they debated who was going to kill Herb Clutter and finally Smith said he would do it. Smith said he hid a knife along his arm away from Clutter’s line of sight and told Clutter he was going to tighten the cords on his hand and then he cut Clutter’s throat. In Dewey’s testimony, Smith commits murder “with full consciousness and intent” while in Smith’s version as rendered by Capote, his responsibility is diminished because he suffers what Capote later termed in interviews a “brain explosion” or a “mental eclipse” (Tompkins 166-67).

The accuracy of Tompkins’ most serious charge – that Capote’s book seriously distorted the actual Smith – was not contested by Capote in any letter to *Esquire* over the next year, even though he had replied vigorously and at length to an earlier attack by the English critic Kenneth Tynan (*Tynan Right and Left* 447-52). But Capote was supported by William Nance who noted that in the scene with Cullivan mentioned earlier, Smith explicitly says he is not sorry for what he did and that Tompkins’ depiction of Smith as an “obscene, semiliterate and cold-blooded killer” is a cliché (*The Worlds of Truman Capote* 215). It is possible, though, to read Smith’s gallows step apology as repudiating his earlier callousness and gaining redemption. That, along with the potential to read Capote’s portrait of Smith as a killer whose talents

were blighted by a miserable childhood, also teeters on cliché. More usefully, Nance contributes the insight that in the five years between Capote and Smith's first meeting and the execution, each affected the other. Smith aspired to be an artist and was entranced with Capote from the moment the writer dropped Bogart's name during their first interview – Bogart had starred in a film for which Capote wrote the screenplay (Capote papers Box 11, Folder 1). Capote looked at Smith and saw his “shadow” as his biographer puts it (Clarke 326). Harper Lee, who worked with Capote on the book's research, says: “Perry was a killer, but there was something touching about him. I think every time Truman looked at Perry he saw his own childhood” (Nance 211).

If from this, you could conclude that the vividness of Capote's portrayal of Perry Smith stems partly from it being a self-portrait, that does not quite do justice to the impact Capote's book appears to still have on many readers. Nor, though, does the book's continuing influence absolve its creator of the very real ethical issues he faced and, in significant ways, failed to overcome. Capote's talent as a writer, then, enables him to draw readers deeper into the world of his book than does Woodward, but that alone does not help him resolve ethical issues. If anything, it magnifies them. Madelaine Blais, a practitioner of book-length journalism and a writing teacher, infers from Capote's stated intention to use the Clutter murders for a literary experiment: “There is something creepy about the prettiness of the prose in contrast to the grotesquerie of the killings. In the end, the author may have driven himself nearly insane with the question: what purpose is served by making art out of something so vile?” (Sims *True Stories* 241).

Does criticism of Woodward and Capote's use of an omniscient narrative persona mean it is impossible to use ethically? As it is a common feature of realist texts, how much doubt does it cast on such books? It certainly means the practitioner offers the reader the reassurance that their book reveals exactly how things happened, which is a false reassurance, but does that mean all works of book-length journalism need a narrative voice continually waving disclaimers at the reader that nobody really knows what happened? This is an exaggeration, but one of the pleasures and the benefits of a narrative approach is that it helps us make sense of the chaos of life. If use of an omniscient narrative voice raises difficult and pressing ethical issues, these can be offset either within the text by signalling the contingency of the material

presented, as Lukas does in *Nightmare*, or by providing detailed sourcing and attribution of information in endnotes and bibliographies, as Marr and Wilkinson do in *Dark Victory*. John Hersey, both in *Hiroshima* and in his criticism of aspects of the New Journalism, showed himself to be a realist in Eason's framework. *Hiroshima* was ranked first on the Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century (See Appendix C) and remains in print more than six decades after publication but it was also attacked by critics on publication as the prime example of an all-pervading understatement in *The New Yorker* whose "denatured naturalism" and "antiseptic" prose becomes a "moral deficiency." The novelist Mary McCarthy accused Hersey of avoiding the event's unique nature by treating it like a natural disaster rendered through the standard journalistic lens of "human interest stories" (Lifton and Mitchell 89).

Understatement does characterize journalism in *The New Yorker*. When *Hiroshima* was published, in 1946, the magazine's editor, Harold Ross, took the rare step of including a short note to readers suggesting that "everyone might well take time to consider the terrible implications" of the dropping of the first atomic bomb (Hersey "A Reporter at Large" 15). It is hard to imagine a bigger understatement. It is important to recall the historical context, though (Stone *Literary Aftershocks* 2-14). The Second World War had ended just a year before and Japanese people were still primarily seen as a defeated enemy. Most of the people killed by the bomb blast were civilians, not soldiers, (Lifton and Mitchell 5) but after Burchett's initial reporting of the bomb's impact, there had been almost nothing about the long term effects on the people of Hiroshima, at least partly because of a confidential request by President Harry Truman to media outlets (Lifton and Mitchell 55). Hersey later recalled he initially considered an article documenting the bomb's power and its destructiveness but decided he wanted to "write about what happened not to buildings but to human beings" (Lifton and Mitchell 86-87). Hersey travelled to Hiroshima where he interviewed several dozen survivors. It would have been entirely understandable if Hersey had felt overwhelmed by their horrifying accounts. He did feel terrified throughout his three weeks in Hiroshima, but this prompted him to reflect: if that was what he experienced eight months afterwards how must those in the city on 6 August 1945 have felt? (Lifton and Mitchell 87) Instead of expressing directly how *he* felt, then, Hersey channelled his energy into enabling the reader, as far as possible, to

sympathise with the bomb survivors' experience. The bomb attack, then, another critic argues, demanded Hersey "provide forms for understanding what has been called history's least imaginable event" (Jones "John Hersey" 214).

A closer reading of *Hiroshima*, then, reveals not an omniscient narrator but one concerned to describe the event as far as possible through the eyes of the six survivors, implicit in which is their limited knowledge beyond their own experience of, say, the political context of the decision to drop the bomb. During the story's editing, Ross raised this in one of his many queries: "This is a story throughout of what people see first hand and (except for a few parenthetical remarks) only that. Did this woman see her dead husband and know it that way? If so should be told that way. If not, should be out" (Yagoda 189). Only occasionally does Hersey comment on the horror he describes, either directly, as when he says of his survivors that they knew they "lived a dozen lives and saw more death" than they ever thought possible (*Hiroshima* 4), or indirectly, when at the end of the first section, "A Noiseless Flash," Hersey writes: "There, in the tin factory, in the first moment of the atomic age, a human being was crushed by books" (23). The absence of open signals to the reader about the article's reportorial underpinnings, combined with Hersey's conscious decision to as far as possible remove himself from the narrative, undoubtedly increases the likelihood of it being read as "antiseptic," but a fuller understanding of the context in which Hersey wrote shows he was anything but uncaring and that sometimes in prose less affect can make a more powerful impact. I still remember how deeply moved I was on first reading *Hiroshima* 50 years after publication and half a world away, and how commonly shared that response was among students in journalism classes I took over the next decade.

A practitioner's decision to foreground their presence in a narrative may have stemmed from their belief that effacing themselves from what they write is itself unethical, or at the least unrealistic. Didion refuses to be simply a "camera eye" (*Slouching Toward Bethlehem* 12) and Mailer argues objective news reporting hides as much as it reveals (*The Armies of the Night* 4). If ethical issues arise when journalists ignore or suppress their subjective response to people and events they write about, so at the other end of the spectrum problems arise when practitioners fix on their subjective response at the expense of people and events they write about. Where one kind of narrative mode denies the people being written about their full

humanity by an inability or unwillingness to engage with them, the other kind denies subjects their full humanity by treating them as less important than the journalist's own subjectivity. Hunter S. Thompson illustrates both the value and the problems of a practitioner writing in an avowedly individual narrative voice. Thompson was continually at odds with orthodox objective reporting, which he regarded as utterly incapable of getting at what was happening in the world (*Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72* 44), but throughout his life Thompson identified himself as a journalist, to the point where he once threatened to sue *Esquire* magazine after it (mis)quoted him saying that only "45 per cent of what I write is true" (*Fear and Loathing in America* 642) on the ground that it would cripple his "credibility as a journalist" (Italics in original 643). Thompson distinguished between his political journalism and *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas*, which he acknowledged moved freely between fiction and verifiable fact (643).

Thompson's work of book-length journalism, *Hell's Angels*, however, provided readers with a great deal more accurate information about the gang and a great deal more insight into its members than had the mainstream news media (McKeen *Outlaw Journalist* 111-12; Thompson *The Proud Highway* 497-503). His book *Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72* was described by Frank Mankiewicz, the political director of Democrat candidate George McGovern's campaign, as "the most accurate and least factual book" about the 1972 American presidential election (E. Jean Carroll *Hunter* 153-54). By that, Mankiewicz was referring to Thompson's now widely known "gonzo" style, whose three main elements are: the foregrounding of the journalist's subjective response to whatever it is they are writing about, the possibility they will be as much a participant as an observer, and that they will make the process of getting the story visible to readers, to the point where it may become the primary focus of the piece of writing (Wenner and Seymour *Gonzo* 125-26; McKeen *Outlaw Journalist* 148-50). Thompson's political journalism, which first appeared in *Rolling Stone* before being published in book form, differed wildly from that of the regular White House correspondents, who as Crouse showed in *The Boys on the Bus*, were unreflective, reactive and prone to a herd mentality. Thompson wrote what the other correspondents thought but could not write. Failed Democrat candidate Edmund Muskie "talked like a farmer with terminal cancer trying to borrow money on next year's crop" (*Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72*

138). As a novice to political journalism, Thompson worked hard to understand the political process and took trouble to explain it for general readers (Dunn “*Rolling Stone’s Coverage of the 1972 U.S. Presidential Election*” 41).

The value, then, of Thompson’s approach to book-length journalism is clear and enduring; the problems it created eventually overwhelmed his work and, eventually, him. Sometimes, the journalist’s subjective response is not the most important thing about an event, as the bombing of Hiroshima exemplifies, and over time Thompson’s focus on the difficulties he faced doing his work became contrived, even counterproductive, as when he was sent by *Rolling Stone* to Zaire to cover the George Foreman-Muhammad Ali heavyweight title match but chose to smoke marijuana in the hotel swimming pool, and did not file a word on one of the most remarkable bouts in boxing history (McKeen 228-30). Over time Thompson became known less for his writing than for his lifestyle. His gargantuan intake of drugs, whiskey and cigarettes curtailed his ability to get out of his Woody Creek compound and participate in events he wanted to write about. Originally a serious, diligent practitioner, Thompson ended up trapped by the myth he had created, as I have argued elsewhere (“Accidental Outlaw”). Douglas Brinkley, Thompson’s literary executor, says that, tragically, he chose to commit suicide, in 2005, rather than seek help because he believed if the headline “Thompson Put in Detox Hospital” was ever written his fans would see him as just another frail old man (Wenner and Seymour 417).

The practitioners interviewed by Boynton have developed narrative voices in their work that avoid the pitfalls evident in the work of Woodward and Capote at one end of the spectrum and Thompson at the other. Individual narrative voices differ, of course, but Conover’s *Newjack* illuminates just how far current practitioners have advanced. As an exercise in journalistic participation-observation *Newjack* is every bit as dangerous as Thompson’s riding with Hell’s Angels. Most of the book is written in a first person narrative voice but there is none of Thompson’s relentless self-dramatising. Thompson was twenty-seven when he met the bikers (McKeen *Outlaw Journalist 2*; Thompson *Proud Highway* 498); Conover was twelve years older (Boynton 4) when he spent eleven months working as a guard in Sing Sing prison and the author’s photograph on *Newjack* shows him as a plain-looking man with friendly eyes. That Conover presents himself as an everyman helps readers

identify with him. His vivid description of his struggle to manage more than sixty inmates accompanied only by a similarly inexperienced colleague (71-79), induces in the reader heart-pounding anxiety, as I have discussed elsewhere (*Writing Feature Stories* 230-32). Not only do you fear what might happen to Conover but begin imagining whether you could cope in the same circumstance. Deeply engaged in Conover's experiences, the reader is willing, eager even, to learn more about the American prison system, which Conover provides in thoroughly researched detail woven into his first person narrative voice. Conover rarely discusses the impact his assignment has on his home life, so when he does it is all the more powerful. He is minding his two small children one evening when one begins misbehaving and he smacks him, something he had never done before. Immediately remorseful, Conover reads a book in bed to his son, who sobs for an hour before settling. Over time, Conover falls into a pattern of falling asleep on his son's bed after reading the night time story. His wife is sceptical, but Conover finds it "the sweetest thing in my day" even as he knows "It was an excuse, an evasion, a way not to examine the fact that I'd never been meaner or more vulnerable" (245).

Analysis of the narrative voice in a work of book-length journalism needs to be accompanied by analysis of other elements, such as the ethical issues journalists face in describing people and events, in reconstructing scenes and in whether they should write interior monologues. These are not simply "technical" issues, as Capote and, for that matter, Ross of *The New Yorker*, described them (Yagoda *About Town* 189), though they certainly involve the techniques of writing. To say they are only technical is to ignore the ethical dimension, which requires practitioners to keep in mind the virtues inherent in journalism – truthfulness, independence and social justice – with the capacity of these elements of narrative that engage readers emotionally as well as intellectually. That is to say the purposes and collective ethic of book-length journalism and fiction are not identical, though they may overlap in parts. Examining these elements of practice one by one, description is a potent part of writing in a narrative mode as it can draw a reader deep into an event or a person's life. Its potential for intrusiveness raises ethical issues. How do journalists describe people, their appearance, their actions, gestures, mood, behaviour and their interaction with others? How do they balance their obligation to the reader with their obligation to those they write about? In general, readers want vivid, intimate

description, while sources, understandably, want to be presented in the best possible light, or at least in a tactful way. If a person's actions are rendered in a narrative mode, how can practitioners know what particular actions mean and how readers will interpret those actions as represented in the book? In this area novelists clearly enjoy greater freedom, and not simply because of questions about accuracy in representation. Novelists can and do create characters who are physically disgusting, or morally repugnant or, at a more mundane level, have foibles and blind spots. Characters in novels have every possible human attribute. One of the pleasures a novel offers is the depth of observation of a character; a work of book-length journalism may well contain sharp observations of the people in it, but here practitioners need to find a balance between honouring the virtues of honesty and compassion.

Detailed and vividly written description of people and events will induce in readers a strong emotional response that could be considered manipulation, but to attempt to cauterize emotions from a description is also manipulation, though it is manipulating by omission rather than commission. Most practitioners value time they spend observing events and people at first hand and journalists' descriptions of what they observe are well recognized as one of the strengths of book-length journalism. Readers, too, value vivid description in journalism, whether practiced in newspaper, magazines or in books. Carey acknowledges that journalism cannot get beyond language because it is language itself but in editing an historical anthology of reportage he had to trudge through countless clichéd accounts of battles containing phrases like "Our horse inflicted severe punishment on the enemy's right flank" (*Faber Book of Reportage* xxxi) before selecting journalism that contained "unusual or indecorous or incidental images that imprinted themselves scaldingly on the mind's eye" (xxxii). He listed nearly a dozen examples, including an ambassador peering down the front of Queen Elizabeth I's dress and noticing the wrinkles, boxer Joe Louis' nostrils flared like a double-barrelled shotgun and the starving Irish whose mouths were green from a diet of grass. Such descriptions combat the "inevitable and planned retreat of language from the real" (xxxii). Different practitioners will observe and describe different things, depending on their background. But it seems undeniable that some practitioners observe more acutely than others; some are more intellectually and emotionally honest than others. Even careful, honest observation of

principal sources and events will not convey everything about them, but it will convey something, and, in the hands of a good practitioner, will convey something powerful about them.

Journalists can ask themselves several questions to help determine whether their descriptive passages are ethical. First, is the description relevant? In one of the books released in 1982 soon after Lindy Chamberlain was convicted of murdering her baby Azaria, Simmonds refers to how he and other journalists indulged in the “not-unpleasant past-time of Lindy-watching” during her trial: “When she wore a filmy apricot dress with thin straps over the shoulders, male onlookers ogled her shamelessly, many tipping that she was braless underneath” (*Azaria: Wednesday’s Child* 127). Simmonds’ description is prurient rather than relevant, which is evident in other passages describing her physical appearance in detail (27-28, 46, 138, 161 and 177). Lindy’s husband Michael was described too but less often and in less detail. Second, is the particular action of the person being described a fair indicator of their overall behaviour? Practitioners working on book-length projects should be able to overcome this hurdle because they spend a good deal more time with their principal sources than do daily journalists who are prone to over-read offhand remarks and everyday incidents. Tad Friend, of *The New Yorker*, comments that when an interview in *The New York Times* with the former lead singer of Fleetwood Mac began “The miniature cheesecake sat in front of Stevie Nicks like a cruel temptation” it transpires, Friend writes, that “the wee pastry must bear the weight of being an indication that the onetime substance-and food-abusing ‘Ms Nicks knows something about indulgence, and about paying the price for it’” (“Notes on the Death of the Celebrity Profile” 45).

Fairness does not necessarily equate to niceness. In 2001, Julie Salamon’s extraordinary work of book-length journalism, *Facing the Wind*, was published. It is about a married couple, Bob and Mary Rowe, one of whose children is disabled. They become part of a close-knit group of parents of disabled children. After years of caring for the boy, Bob Rowe becomes depressed, then delusional, and one day kills his wife and three children with a baseball bat. He is found not guilty of the crime by reason of insanity. After spending more than two years in a psychiatric hospital he is released, remarries happily and eventually dies of cancer aged sixty-eight. Near the end of the book is a scene describing a meeting between Rowe’s second wife,

Colleen, and the families of the now grown disabled children. It occupies thirty-four pages of *Facing the Wind* and is as harrowing to read as it is compelling. Colleen loved Rowe, the women loved his first wife and were still angry and grieving over the deaths. What had happened to the Rowe family was, writes Salamon, “a monstrous story” but Rowe was not “a monstrous man.” (xii). Salamon’s rendering of the scene quivers with the participants’ intensely felt, sometimes ugly emotions, but is also respectful of their vulnerability. It appears as fair to all parties as it could be, but Salamon discloses far more than is published in most newspaper and magazine articles.

Third, journalists should ask whether the description is aimed at evoking an emotion or is being used as a substitute for an argument. In *The Journalist and the Murderer*, for instance, Malcolm describes in detail Joe McGinniss’s own description in an earlier book of him stealing of a can of crabmeat from Willian Styron that the novelist had been saving for a special occasion. She writes that it signifies “the dire theme of Promethean theft, of transgression in the service of creativity, of stealing as the foundation of making” (14). Perhaps it does, but without wishing to defend McGinniss’s decorum as a house guest, I would argue Malcolm uses the description to provoke readers’ disgust at McGinniss’s apparent selfishness. Further, a single incident is asked to carry a disproportionate amount of weight for an argument that Malcolm has not really developed beyond a sharp observation. Practitioners of book-length journalism usually inquire into the underlying meanings of the events they write about and in so doing develop an overall argument, but they are also telling a story. At one end of this continuum sits something akin to an academic thesis; at the other is what is known in journalism as “one hell of a damn story” (Lemann “Weaving Story and Idea” 114). Ambitious practitioners such as Nicholas Lemann aim to marry the two, but not all practitioners are equipped to do this. Similarly, some events and issues are so dense and complex as to resist being told in an accessible narrative mode, while others are simpler and may well not carry meanings much beyond their surface. The implication for practitioners is to be as clear as possible in their own minds about the relationship between meaning, argument and story in their work.

Journalists face substantial difficulty even attempting to represent some aspects of people’s lives in a work of book-length journalism; they also need to think about

how they can provide the reader with enough information to enable them to assess or at least be comfortable with the book's truth-telling claims. The first point goes to journalists reconstructing scenes they did not witness and of writing an interior monologue about what a person is thinking and feeling. The second goes to questions of how material can be attributed in a book, or for that matter how a person is quoted or whether journalists should use composite characters. Readers may or may not be interested in every detail of how practitioners gathered their material, but do need some information about the process if they are to trust the book's truth-telling claims, especially as book-length journalism is primarily the work of one person and does not have the institutional and historical weight of a newspaper or magazine masthead standing behind it. The amount of information required may vary depending on the subject matter; a book about, say, the downfall of a president (*The Final Days*) or a child who killed other children (*Cries Unheard*) would seem to require more rather than less explanatory material. Where Woodward and Bernstein's explanatory material is scant, Sereny's book is written as much in the expository as in the narrative mode. Sereny, too, is an overt presence in the book, continually questioning Mary Bell about her memories and probing to understand why she did what she did. *Cries Unheard* makes for disturbing, challenging reading; unlike many true crime books it is not a racy reconstruction of the crimes that plays to readers' voyeuristic or ghoulish tendencies.

Scenes are integral to book-length journalism written in a narrative mode. Where a journalist was present as a scene unfolded they can observe and describe and the reader will be aware of or at least be on notice that this is one person's observation and description. Some but not all readers will also be aware that the journalist can never be simply the proverbial "fly on the wall." Lillian Ross was one of the first practitioners to be described – and complimented – for being a fly on the wall in her writings about film director John Huston, in *Picture*, among others, but she rejected the term as misguided. Journalists, she argues, cannot "pretend to be invisible, let alone a fly; he or she is seen and heard and responded to by the people he or she is writing about; a reporter is always chemically involved in a story" (*Reporting Back* 5-6). This is surely the case, but it is curiously at odds with Ross's practice, where she usually tries to remove any traces of herself as a presence in her work. It may also explain her surprise when her profile of Ernest Hemingway was read by many as

a “devastating” portrait of an ageing, self-obsessed novelist even though she intended it as sympathetic (Ricketson “Introduction” 11-13). The practice of Capote and Woodward casts doubt on practitioners’ ability to reconstruct scenes they did not witness for themselves, but can it be done ethically? Scholars such as Russell Frank are sceptical about the integrity of reconstructed scenes, arguing that the quest for reader involvement can push aside the need to attribute information to its source. Where practitioners collapse “the distinction between a story based on eyewitness reporting and a story based on other people’s stories, the writers of reconstructions privilege storytelling over reporting, preserve artistic integrity at the expense of journalistic integrity” (“‘You Had to Be There’ (And They Weren’t)” 155). David Craig, a former newspaper copy editor who has become a journalism academic, interviewed sixty practitioners at three major newspapers who told him about their efforts to balance the two, which included subtler forms of attribution than the reflex “she said” at the end of each paragraph and editors’ notes or story boxes that outlined journalists’ sources and research methods (*Ethics of the Story* 53-81). But Frank argues such notes are insufficient unless they specify which parts of the reconstruction came from which sources (156).

Both Frank and Craig are primarily discussing newspaper and magazine journalism but their concerns carry probably even more weight in book-length journalism where practitioners have more time and space to ensure accuracy and where greater accountability to readers is a reasonable expectation. The questions for practitioners to consider in reconstructing scenes include: how important is the scene to the book, is the scene straightforward or highly contested, is it everyday or intimate, how many eyewitness sources does the practitioner have and is there supporting documentation? (Lorenz “When You Weren’t There” 480). These questions go to the gathering of material; there are other questions concerning where along the continuum practitioners sit in either drawing the reader deep into their narrative mode or signalling to them the limits of their representation. Among the nineteen practitioners interviewed by Boynton, twelve said they have reconstructed scenes or, where they were not asked the question directly, it is clear from statements in their own work or from critics that they have. These practitioners are: Cramer (*What It Takes* ix), Finnegan (96), Harr (119), Kotlowitz (*There Are No Children Here* 307-09), Kramer (Lehman *Matters of Fact* 44-49), LeBlanc (246), Lewis (264), Orlean (287-88),

Preston (315), Rosenbaum (334), Trillin (392) and Wright (*Remembering Satan* 202). Of the other seven, they either did not discuss the issue or their works are grounded mostly in their own firsthand observation and in documentary evidence. Among the Australian practitioners, all but one, Garner, say they have reconstructed scenes in their works of book-length journalism (Personal interviews).

The majority of practitioners may have reconstructed scenes, but all preferred to observe events first hand, and most were acutely conscious of the ethical difficulties. For instance, Lewis says “What *really* makes the scene swing on the page are the little things that nobody but the writer would ever notice” but if unable to be present he is “happy to reconstruct it after talking to everyone else who was” (Italics in original 264). Orlean is anxious to make clear to the reader that in any reconstructed scenes “the construction shows” and is “repulsed” when a practitioner writes a scene as if they had been present when they were not (287). Between these two is LeBlanc who spent eleven years researching and writing her account of impoverished families living in the Bronx. She accumulated vast files and observed her principal sources hundreds of times but on occasion she reconstructed events she had not witnessed. To do this she would get information from as many sources as she could, interview them repeatedly and, where possible, ask them to take her to visit the place where the scene happened, and show her who stood where, and even draw pictures and charts. Two of the people in the book, Cesar and Coco, spent a weekend at a hotel in the Poconos. “To verify whether they gave me the right details I drove up to the hotel and took photographs of their room and interviewed the hotel management. I asked ‘Were the bedspreads that color? Was the décor the same then? Then I showed the pictures to Cesar and Coco in order to stir their memories” (Boynton, 246-47). Some other practitioners have been equally, perhaps even more, painstaking in their efforts (Harrington “The Writer’s Choice” 505-07). Where LeBlanc’s comments illustrate the thoroughness of her efforts to reconstruct scenes ethically, Rosenbaum says his views have changed as he has learnt that no matter how much material he gathers he cannot write a “seamless narrative.” He now expects to hear conflicting points of view. “It is often from the seams of the narrative that the really interesting questions emerge. *Why* do these people’s stories conflict? *What* are their agendas?” (Italics in original Boynton 334).

Sebastian Junger's *A Perfect Storm* exemplifies not only the difficulties of reconstructing scenes but how a journalist might responsibly approach such difficulties. The book is about a freak confluence of weather that produced what meteorologists call a "perfect" storm – that is, one that could not be worse – which claimed the lives of six men on board a sword-fishing boat, the *Andrea Gail*, in 1991. The book became a bestseller and was subsequently filmed, starring George Clooney and Mark Wahlberg. The question, of course, is how did Junger reconstruct what happened when none on board the *Andrea Gail* survived? In a foreword and an acknowledgments section Junger makes clear the limits of what could be known about the event. He interviewed the dead fishermen's families and friends as well as those on other boats who had survived the storm. He interviewed people who had been in similar situations to gain an appreciation of what might have happened on board the *Andrea Gail*. Any dialogue that is quoted in the book is drawn from interviewees' recollections; none was made up, he writes (xv-xvii and 300-01). Junger does write about how the fishermen died, but he does not appear to step over the boundary into writing fiction. He gathered as much information as he could from experts and describes over eight pages what happens when a person drowns, from how the instinct not to breathe underwater is so strong that it overcomes the agony of running out of air, to how the body responds to the first involuntary breathing in of water, and how the panic of dying is mixed with a peculiar sense of disbelief. "Having never done it before, the body – and the mind – do not know how to die gracefully. The process is filled with desperation and awkwardness. 'So this is drowning,' a drowning person might think" (180). Critically, as Rule and Wheeler argue, writing what a "drowning person might think" differs from putting that thought into the mind of a particular person (*True Stories: Guides for Writing from Your Life* 224-25). Junger buttresses his informed speculation with an account from a medical journal of a man who survived a near-drowning; it has the added effect of reminding the reader that the book is non-fiction (*The Perfect Storm* 181-84). This section of the book is deeply discomfiting to read, though, because the level of detail Junger provides forces the reader to stop and imagine a universally terrifying prospect – drowning. The reader's engagement is, in its own way, as deep as that experienced by readers of a work of fiction, but it is anchored in ethical practice.

If a sizeable minority of practitioners and scholars believe reconstruction of scenes poses difficulties for journalists, there is even more concern about representing people's thoughts and feelings in an interior monologue. The attraction for practitioners of writing an interior monologue is that it immerses readers in people's innermost thoughts and feelings, providing a level of intimacy and sense of knowingness. It is a distinctive, if not unique, feature of the novel, according to Wolfe (*The New Journalism* 63-65), and it is the element of the narrative mode that is furthest from hard news reporting. Wolfe, with a characteristically insouciant sweeping aside of concerns, conceives of this level of intimacy in journalism as simply "one more doorbell a reporter had to push" (*The New Journalism* 35). He points to a profile he wrote in the early 1960s of the pop music producer Phil Spector that describes how he felt as an aeroplane readied for take-off: "All these raindrops are *high* or something. They don't roll down the window, they come straight back, toward the tail, wobbling, like all those Mr Cool snow heads walking on mattresses" (Italics in original 34). When asked about Wolfe's hyperkinetic portrait, Spector confirmed the passage was "quite accurate," which Wolfe writes was not surprising as it was founded on his long interview with Spector (33). A number of critics remain unconvinced. Fuller asks whether the passage fairly represented what Spector thought and felt at the time or was his apparently gleeful description of it later. "The man on the other side of the door often lies about his inner state. He may even lie to himself" ("News and Literary Technique" 148-49).

Fuller's point is apt but also not surprising, which prompts the question: why does Wolfe place unblinking trust in an interview as a means of understanding exactly what a person thought and felt at a given moment? Hersey's answer is that the most distinctive element of the interior monologues Wolfe creates in his work of book-length journalism, *The Right Stuff*, is how most of them sound like him, whether astronauts, their wives or even a chimpanzee test pilot. "Right Stuffers who are alleged to speak nothing but Army Creole are garlanded with elegant tidbits like *esprit, joie de combat, mas allá!*....God help us, God becomes Tom Wolfe and with His sweet ear chooses the Wolfeish 'n inny'" ("The Legend on the License" 255). It is a good answer even if Hersey understates Wolfe's ability to adopt different narrative voices, such as the southern drawl of Chuck Yeager (*The Right Stuff* 45-46). Hersey also perhaps misreads the tone of these interior monologues. That most

of them hum with the current of Wolfe's energy and comic brio draws attention to Wolfe's artifice; that is, what Wolfe does is a form of impersonation. The subjects of Wolfe's work may be seen squarely through his eyes, but not necessarily fairly, according to Lehman who argues that in *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* Wolfe sometimes writes interior monologues for people he gives no indication of having interviewed (*Matters of Fact* 59).

There is only marginal support among practitioners for Wolfe's unclouded view of the ethical difficulty of writing interior monologue. In Kramer and Call's selection of talks given to the annual narrative journalism conference, Jack Hart, managing editor and writing coach at *The Oregonian*, describes it as a "staple for successful narrative nonfiction writers" (*Telling True Stories* 236) but in the same volume Roy Peter Clark of the Poynter Institute says it is a "dangerous strategy but permissible in the most limited circumstances" (168) and in his creative non-fiction textbook Cheney writes: "In the hands of the inept, or the ept but unscrupulous, it is an easy device behind which to hide unethical writing behavior" (222). Among Boynton's interviewees, only five say they write interior monologues or, where they were not asked the question directly, it is clear from statements in their own work or from critics that they have. These practitioners are: Cramer (*What it Takes* ix), Harr (118), Kramer (Lehman *Matters of Fact* 46-47) Preston (302, 321) and Talese (*The Kingdom and the Power* 529; *Honor Thy Father* 516). Wright appears to have changed his view between 1994 when he included interior monologues in *Remembering Satan* (202) and his interview with Boynton about a decade later (454). Of the others, ten did not discuss it and the remaining three – Lewis (264), Orlean (288) and Trillin (401) – strongly oppose use of interior monologues. Of the Australian practitioners, only two (Blackburn, Bryson) say they have written interior monologues, while four (Garner, Hooper, Knox and Marr) say they do not and one (Simons) is chary but will not rule it out completely (Personal interviews).

The questions practitioners might ask themselves about interior monologues are the same as those for reconstructing scenes, with even more weight put on the degree of cooperation provided by the source to ensure accuracy, and on whether the monologue is for someone well known. Preston (Boynton 296) and Talese (363) have both written interior monologues without attracting the criticism levelled at Wolfe, but both appear to have gained full cooperation from their sources, including

for extensive checking, and both write about relatively unknown people. Talese gained such complete cooperation from the son of a Mafia boss for his book *Honor Thy Father* that the criticism he draws was not for presuming to know another's thoughts but that he became so close as to lose his sense of perspective about organized crime (Boynton 354). In *The Hot Zone*, Preston's book about an outbreak of the Ebola virus, he writes an interior monologue for a military scientist, Nancy Jaax, at the moment she fears (wrongly) that she might be infected, and she is annoyed she has forgotten to go to the bank that day. Preston told Boynton: "It rang absolutely true when she first described her thoughts to me. But then I went over it again and again until I was finally sure that this was – to the best of her recollection – what she thought at that moment." (321). Cramer, however, writes interior monologues for presidential candidates, which attracts intense scrutiny both from the principal sources and from critics. It does appear Cramer was similarly thorough. In a note to the reader he writes that he interviewed more than a thousand people and that "In every case, thoughts attributed to the characters in this book have been checked with them, or with the people to whom they confided those thoughts" (ix). Cramer provides no endnotes, however, and this coupled with his habit of writing about well known, important people with slangy intimacy – he refers to Republican Bob Dole as "the Bobster" – drew criticism for reincarnating "Wolfe's faded New Journalism technique" (Boynton 34).

It is not impossible, then, to ethically write interior monologues but it is certainly difficult and so it is more common for practitioners to avoid interior monologues, on the grounds that they are too difficult to do successfully, that the margin for error is too great, the consequences of failure too serious and, finally, because they probably really are the domain of fiction. If sources get upset about being misquoted they are even angrier by the presumption that a journalist knows what is going on in their head, as Blackburn found with the surviving family of serial killer Eric Edgar Cooke. Lewis told Boynton he disapproved of journalists such as Woodward claiming to capture their subjects' inner thoughts. "I don't believe it for a second. His characters end up having the capacity to feel only what Bob Woodward feels. And it is always the *same* feeling" (Italics in original 264). Marr, Hooper and Orlean all say they are content to know that not every element of fiction-writing is available to practitioners of book-length journalism (Personal interviews; Boynton 288), and Knox says he

feels no pressing need to write interior monologue “because I am not a frustrated novelist who is writing non-fiction” (Personal interview). These practitioners’ views exemplify Doložel’s framework for understanding the boundaries between fiction and factual narrative. If limits are imposed on practitioners writing in a narrative mode by their commitment to represent people, events and issues as accurately as possible, a balancing power accrues to the relationship between the book and the actual world that novelists can never quite claim. As David Lodge, a novelist and literary academic, puts it: “For the reader the guarantee that the story is ‘true’ gives it a compulsion that no fiction can quite equal” (*The Art of Fiction* 203).

When practitioners sit down to represent their research in a narrative mode, there is an inherent tension between their commitment to veracity and their desire to engage readers as fully as possible. In book-length journalism, the ethical issues of representation are all seen through this prism. The issues are sparked by the initial taking of a narrative approach to representing people, events and issues rather than by the individual practitioner’s literary ability. This is the case for both a journeyman writer such as Woodward and an unquestioned prose stylist such as Capote. The relationship between the practitioner’s research work and their writing is perhaps more significant than their individual literary ability. Both Woodward and Capote’s ethical problems began in the research phase and were aggravated in the writing phase. Sereny’s prose style is relatively undistinguished but *Cries Unheard* is grounded in strong ethical practice both in the research and writing. Conversely, Garner is a superb prose stylist but *The First Stone* is seriously flawed by problems arising in the research phase and compounded in the writing phase. Conover’s *Newjack* offers a further possibility; it is both ethically researched (notwithstanding his deception in working undercover) and he is a highly accomplished, if unobtrusive, writer. These conclusions derive from examining individual works of book-length journalism; as such they can be only suggestive about the extent to which they apply to other works in this field. By examining various elements of representing people and events in a narrative mode, it becomes clear that the omniscient narrative voice is particularly fraught in book-length journalism because it offers a knowingness that is all but impossible to achieve, but that unbridled subjectivity also has serious shortcomings. Observing and describing people and events raises manageable ethical issues for practitioners, while reconstructing scenes

creates thorny issues, and the interior monologue thornier still. Leading practitioners resolve these issues, not least because they appear to have learnt from the excesses of the New Journalists and applied practical wisdom in making judgments in their practice. They both understand and accept the limitations of book-length journalism as well as its still extensive possibilities. In doing so, they appreciate that book-length journalism is, like fiction, about telling stories, but as their stories make claims to represent actual people, events and issues, they work within the regulative ideal of journalism as an ethical activity.

CHAPTER SIX: ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING IN PRACTITIONERS' RELATIONSHIP WITH READERS OF BOOK-LENGTH JOURNALISM

Invariably, the most profitable conversations are ones that come after a degree of trust has developed between the journalist and his source. This relationship is fraught with problems, since trust and friendship go hand in hand. Knowledge is seductive; the reporter wants to know, and the more he knows, the more interesting he becomes to the source. There are few forces in human nature more powerful than the desire to be understood; journalism couldn't exist without it. But the intimacy that comes with sharing secrets and unburdening profound feelings invites a reciprocal degree of friendly protection that a reporter cannot always offer. By the conspicuous use of a tape recorder and extensive note-taking, I try to remind both of us that there is a third party in the room, the eventual reader.

Lawrence Wright (*The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda's Road to 9/11* 449).

Until this point, I have been asserting that practitioners generally compose their works of book-length journalism with intended readers in mind but beyond stating the common journalistic goal of reaching the broadest possible audience, I have not examined the implications of that assertion for practitioners. It is in this chapter I look at how practitioners need to consider exactly what they are offering readers. After the research and the writing phase have been completed – that is, at the moment of publication – the practitioner's principal sources are present only as represented in the book, and the journalist is present primarily as a narrative voice and secondarily as an author promoting their work. Just as the practitioner's conduct during the research phase of book-length journalism influences how they represent

people, events and issues, so the practitioner's approach to the writing phase influences the kind of relationship they seek to establish with readers. The main ethical questions that arise for practitioners at this stage of the process are: what are they offering or, to put it another way, what are they promising to deliver to readers? What expectations do readers have of a work of book-length journalism? Where a work of book-length journalism is written primarily in an expository mode the nature of the journalist's offering to readers is readily apparent, as it is in hard news reports, and so will not be considered in any detail here.

The majority of practitioners write primarily in a narrative mode, but their work is published in a book rather than a newspaper or magazine; will readers think the work is a novel, or do they readily distinguish between novels and works of book-length journalism? This is not an implausible question; for most people, journalism is what they read in newspapers, hear on radio, watch on television or do all three online. Similarly, non-fiction is associated with information and knowledge. Short stories used to be widely published in newspapers and magazines but that happens infrequently today (Tebbel and Zuckerman *The Magazine in America* 73-74, 249-50; Munro and Sheahan-Bright *Paper Empires* 239-57; 362-68). For most of the past two centuries the novel has been a highly popular book form (Nell *Lost in a Book* 15-25). Do journalists, and their publishers, then, need to help readers see clearly what kind of book they are reading, and if so, how can they do this, whether in the text itself, or outside it in endnotes, notes to the reader, dust-jacket copy and promotional interviews? If the nature of the book presented is ambiguous, what are the ramifications for readers? In other words, does the notion of principal sources giving informed consent to practitioners in the research phase need to be matched by readers having what I would term informed trust in a work of book-length journalism? Finally, does the practitioner's move from daily print journalism to book publishing affect the level of fact-checking or attention paid to potential lawsuits, and what are the implications of these practices for what journalists offer readers?

Readers are accustomed to a high degree of playfulness about authors' claims for a work of fiction; the genre is predicated, after all, on what Samuel Coleridge, discussing poetry, termed a willing suspension of disbelief (*English Romantic Writers* 452). There is less scope for such playfulness in book-length journalism, or in other non-fiction genres, which make claims to be representing actual people,

events and issues. Practitioners have ethical obligations to those they write for as well as those they write about, but regardless of how carefully they write, practitioners ultimately cannot control how people will read their work. Readers may read a work as the practitioner hopes they will, or they may well find other meanings and interpretations. That practitioners are unable to control exactly what readers make of their work does not absolve them of any ethical obligations to readers. Indeed, I would argue that practitioners' obligations to readers are heightened because the readership for book-length journalism is general not specialist. That is, the average reader knows little about the people and events being written about, in contrast to academic books whose audience is almost entirely specialist and on more equal footing with the author. The journalist has gathered the information and, if they have been thorough, will know a good deal more about the topic than most of their readers. They carry considerable power, then, to shape readers' perceptions of the people and events being written about. I acknowledge some general readers will know a good deal about the people and events represented in works of book-length journalism but the majority will not. In any case, because journalists aim to reach the broadest possible audience they need to assume readers have less rather than more knowledge of the topic.

Once the reader begins reading, there is a range of ways the journalist can signal the kind of book being offered. To the extent that the journalist avoids endnotes, notes on sources and the like and writes primarily in a narrative mode, they increase the likelihood their book will be read as if it is fiction, especially given that the majority of readers – and at least some scholars – conflate the narrative mode with fiction. This prompts a key ethical issue. When a journalist seeks to present the world as it is their narrative mode resembles that of socially realistic fiction. In such works, the journalist wants to engage the reader's mind and emotions as fully as possible. They want to induce in the reader a dreamlike state of mind, as the novelist and creative writing teacher John Gardner termed it in *The Art of Fiction*, published in 1983.

If we carefully inspect our experience as we read, we discover that the importance of physical detail is that it creates for us a kind of dream, a rich and vivid play in the mind. We read a few words at the beginning of the book or the particular story, and suddenly we find ourselves seeing not words on a page but a train moving through Russia, an old

Italian crying, or a farmhouse battered by rain. We read on – dream on – not passively but actively, worrying about the choices the characters have to make, listening in panic for some sound behind the fictional door, exulting in characters’ successes, bemoaning their failures. In great fiction, the dream engages us heart and soul; we not only respond to imaginary things – sights, sounds, smells – as though they were real, we respond to fictional problems as though they were real (30-31).

Gardner argues readers of fiction may feel powerful emotions and may vividly experience the novel’s imagined world but they know that the people and events as presented in the book are not real. There are novels that include actual people and places and events, such as Don DeLillo’s *Libra* which features a character named “Lee Harvey Oswald” and concerns the assassination of John Kennedy, but they do not purport to be a verifiably accurate account of those people, places and events in their entirety (Lehman *Matters of Fact* 25). There are also novels, known as roman à clef, in which actual people and events are represented but their identities are disguised, usually as a way of avoiding a libel suit (Baldick 191).

The reader’s experience of fiction begins with their imaginative engagement with a series of black marks on a page. But when readers talk about their experience of fiction and use phrases such as “I couldn’t put it down” or “I lost all track of time” or “I was off in another world” or “I was lost in the book” – and these phrases have been used so often by readers as to be clichés – they are not voicing resentment but happiness (Nell *Lost in a Book* 1-2). The experience of being deeply engaged in a novelist’s imagined world is welcome and pleasurable. To say a novel is enthralling is to praise it yet the word gives a vital clue to the ethical issue that arises when journalists write in a narrative mode with the aim of inducing in readers Gardner’s fiction dream state. The word enthrall carries two meanings in the Oxford English Dictionary: “to hold spellbound by pleasing qualities” and “to hold in thrall; to enslave.” A reader in thrall, you would think, is in an inherently vulnerable state but their “enslavement” to the fictional world is felt as pleasure precisely because it is confined to the fictional world. It is a state of mind freely entered into and though some novels may be keenly felt and remembered long after they have been returned to the bookshelf, the reader knows that however sad they may feel about, say, the

death of Anna Karenina, she is a character existing only in their imagination from reading Tolstoy's eponymous novel. When a reader gives themselves over to, or is drawn into, this state of mind for a work of book-length journalism, ethical issues are triggered by the differing power relations between practitioners and readers. The journalist writing in a narrative mode, then, has an ethical obligation to readers because of their efforts to "enthrall" them. Should practitioners resort to invention or seriously misrepresent people and events in their work, they will have abused the trust readers placed in them. Craig quotes two practitioners working in newspapers on the implications for journalism of Gardner's fiction dream state. One of them says: "You want people to suspend their disbelief and be carried along with the story in kind of a dream state. And anything that disrupts that is working against your role as a storyteller, which makes the ethical obligation even greater, because once you have them in that dream state you could really screw with their minds" (*The Ethics of the Story* 65).

Applying Gardner's fiction dream state is a powerful idea, and can be expanded to take into account different readers' reading levels and the capacity of the narrative voice to engage us. In his examination of "ludic reading," that is reading for pleasure, Victor Nell argues that what Gardner calls the fiction dream state and he calls "reading trance" can be experienced by reading novels ranging from what he terms "trash" to those normally listed in literary canons. He also argues that "for many sophisticated readers, a wide range of materials, from the trashiest to the most literate and demanding works, may induce reading trance" (*Lost in a Book* xiii). Nell explicitly includes readers' involvement in reading newspaper reports of major news events and argues that it "cannot be distinguished from the way we lose ourselves in a novel" (51). There may be little doubt, as Stephens' historical study shows, that people's hunger for news is a common human yearning across societies and across time (*A History of News* 8), but the experience of reading a hard news report does – in my argument not to mention my experience – differ from reading journalism written in a narrative mode. Gardner is right to draw attention to the use of physical details as triggers for starting the fiction dream state but the use of a narrative voice in book-length journalism can also deeply engage readers. This is obvious in Thompson and Garner's highly idiosyncratic, self-dramatizing narrative voices; it is less obvious but still present in the narrative voice of Conover and of Philip

Gourevitch in his profoundly disturbing work *Standard Operating Procedure*, as I have argued elsewhere (“Drawn to Trouble”). It is not necessary to examine the full range of narrative forms or means by which authors can engage readers. The point here is to highlight the potential ethical issue created when practitioners of book-length journalism induce in readers Gardner’s fiction dream state.

When practitioners offer readers book-length journalism that sits on bookshop shelves alongside other books, both fiction and non-fiction, it is important to recall they write books in their role as journalists serving the human good of social justice. The SPJ’s code of ethics in the United States begins by articulating a belief that “public enlightenment is the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues” (Black, Steele and Barney 6). In Australia the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance code espouses a similar view, adding: “Journalists describe society to itself They search, disclose, record, question, entertain, suggest and remember. They inform citizens and animate democracy” (http://www.alliance.org.au/resources/doc_details/code_of_ethics/). Freedom of the press invokes lofty ideals; it is tempting to recall the acid comment of Ruth Carson in Tom Stoppard’s play *Night and Day*: “I’m with you on the free press. It’s the newspapers I can’t stand” (60). If the codes do espouse the ideal purpose of journalism, they have relatively little specific information for practitioners about their relationship with readers. Two clauses contain principles relevant to book-length journalism. The SPJ code says journalists should ensure headlines, news teases and promotional material should not mislead the audience and the MEAA code says that “Any manipulation likely to mislead should be disclosed.” It can be inferred from these clauses that journalists should make clear the kind of book they are offering readers and include something about their work methods.

Several practitioners of book-length journalism have articulated the terms of their relationship with readers. McPhee, Malcolm and Garner all liken the relationship to a contract; Garner distinguishes between her fiction and non-fiction:

Someone reading a novel wants you to create a new world, parallel perhaps to the ‘real’ one, in which the reader can immerse himself for the duration. But a reader of non-fiction counts on you to remain

faithful to the same ‘real’ world that both reader and writer physically inhabit (“The Art of the Dumb Question” 6).

McPhee lists practices that he finds unacceptable in journalism and says “Where writers abridge that, they hitchhike on the credibility of writers who don’t” (Sims “The Literary Journalists” 15). Any blurring of the line between fiction and non-fiction is anathema to McPhee for whom the image connotes ignorance of where one field ends and the other begins. “That violates a contract with the reader” (16). Malcolm draws an extended metaphor where novelists are masters of their own house and journalists are renters:

The journalist must abide by the conditions of his lease, which stipulates that he leave the house – and its name is Actuality – as he found it. He may bring in his own furniture and arrange it as he likes (the so-called New Journalism is about the arrangement of the furniture) and he may play his radio quietly. But he must not disturb the house’s fundamental structure or tamper with any of its architectural features. The writer of nonfiction is under contract to the reader to limit himself to events that actually occurred and to characters who have counterparts in real life, and he may not embellish the truth about these events or these characters (*The Journalist and the Murderer* 153).

In 1980 Hersey writes that novelists and journalists have a license whose “sacred rule” is, respectively, “THIS WAS MADE UP” and “NONE OF THIS WAS MADE UP” (“The Legend on the License” 248-49). What is noteworthy about these descriptions is that they are all metaphors and that they evoke a solidity to the enterprise that, as Genette argues in discussing the related field of autobiography, “is obviously highly optimistic as to the role of the reader who has signed nothing and who can take this contract or leave it” (*Paratexts* 11 footnote). All four practitioners know this, even as they wax metaphorical. McPhee is acutely aware of the importance his subjectivity plays in choosing a particular word, or particular story structure or even a topic (Sims *True Stories* 304). Garner writes a few sentences after those quoted above that she feels a “responsibility to the ‘facts’ as you can discover them, and an obligation to make it clear when you have *not* been able to discover

them” (Italics in original 7). Malcolm, too, soon after the passage just cited, writes: “Of course, there is no such thing as a work of pure factuality, any more than there is one of pure fictitiousness” (154). And Hersey grants there is no such thing as “absolute objectivity” and no way of presenting in words “*the truth*” (Italics in original 248). The absence of a laser-drawn line dividing fiction from book-length journalism does not mean the two are indistinguishable or that journalists are unable to make clear what they are offering readers. Mark Kramer, director of the Nieman Program on Narrative Journalism, acknowledges there is no Un-Literary-Journalistic-Activities-Committee to subpoena “the craft’s corner cutters” (“Breakable Rules for Literary Journalists” 23). It is another metaphor but at least its use is ironic.

The practitioners’ metaphors gesture toward something they all believe is important rather than provide a framework for understanding what happens between practitioners and their readers. Does the law provide such a framework? Brill argues that it does. In 2000 he reported on a false advertising lawsuit brought by a lawyer, Jeffrey Lerman, on behalf of an aggrieved reader, against a series of financial self-help books. Written by a group of retired women known as the Beardstown Ladies, the books claimed to have achieved a twenty-three per cent annual rate of return but later media reports showed they achieved the more modest rate of nine per cent (“Selling Snake Oil” 66-69). Brill said the false advertising claim derived from the promotional copy on the books’ dust-jackets. Such a lawsuit was preferable to libel which is only set in train when a person believes their reputation has been harmed by the book’s contents. A false advertising suit:

[D]oes not threaten the author’s right to write free of harassment suits (or real suits based on honest mistakes) or even a publisher’s decision to publish a book that has material in it that’s debatable or even wrong. And he’s [Lerman] not using a libel law approach that requires that a victim of what’s written undertake an expensive, long-shot courtroom battle. Instead, what he outlined in his legal papers is a structure that allows any consumer to sue but forces that consumer to clear some sensibly high hurdles (68).

These hurdles were that the material at issue was factually incorrect, that the publisher knew it was incorrect or could have found out if they made a good-faith

effort, and that the material in question was a significant part of the book's advertising. To Brill, consumer protection legislation is well suited to "challenge America's leading consumer product: media" (68) and in the context of book-length journalism it makes sense to highlight the importance of supporting material such as dust-jacket copy.

Since the Beardstown Ladies case, Brill's ideas have borne fruit in the successful lawsuit brought in 2006 against James Frey over his memoir *A Million Little Pieces* that was published in 2003. A memoir is not a work of book-length journalism but it does purport to be offering an account of a person's life. Frey's memoir became a bestseller, with the majority of its 3.5 million sales coming after television host and magazine publisher, Oprah Winfrey, selected it in 2005 for inclusion in Oprah's Book Club. Frey's memoir was written in a hairy-chested, take-no-prisoners style, retailing at length his drug-crazed clashes with police and his time spent in brutal jailhouses. Early in 2006 the website www.thesmokinggun.com revealed that *A Million Little Pieces* was fabricated in many ways, large and small ("A Million Little Lies: Exposing James Frey's Fiction Addiction"). Frey initially denied the website's allegations and was supported by his publisher, Random House, but the documented weight of the website's six-week investigation forced Frey to acknowledge he had altered events and details throughout the book. "A Note to the Reader" was included in later editions in which he admitted, among other things, that where he claimed to have been imprisoned for three months, he now agreed he had spent just five hours in jail while awaiting bail on a misdemeanour. "I made other alterations in my portrayal of myself, most of which portrayed me in ways that made me tougher and more daring and more aggressive than in reality I was, or I am." The unnumbered two page note was inserted in the book on a loose sheet of paper that could easily fall out and not be missed. The back of the book still carries the label "memoir."

Class action lawsuits were lodged against Frey and in September 2006 lawyers representing readers and those representing the publisher agreed to a settlement in which readers who felt they had been defrauded by the book's claims could be refunded the purchase price. ("Frey, publisher settle suits over 'Pieces'"). Late the following year, Associated Press reported that 1729 people were requesting reimbursement, which prompted commentators such as Lee Gutkind, editor of *Creative Nonfiction*, to suggest readers did not seem unduly worried about the factual

reliability of memoirs (Letter *Harper's* January 2008). Gutkind may be right, especially as the publisher had agreed to set aside US\$2.35 million and had spent only US\$27,348 settling claims for refunds (“Judge Approves *A Million Little Pieces* Refund Settlement for Disgruntled Readers”). But a reading of the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement posted by Random House on its website shows the figures are open to another interpretation. For a start, more than half the US\$2.35 million was allocated to legal fees and costs associated with publicizing and carrying out the settlement. Second, only those who bought the book before its fabrications were revealed could claim and to do so they needed to provide proof of purchase, either a receipt for a book that may have been purchased up to three years beforehand, or by supplying the book’s front cover (“Notice to Customers Regarding *A Million Little Pieces*” by James Frey”). Given the relatively low cost of the book – US\$24 in hardback, US\$15 in paperback – and the likelihood that the controversy would have made *A Million Little Pieces* more valuable to collectors, I would argue that the figure of 1729 represents a substantial number of “disgruntled readers.”

A clear cut example of readers’ anger at being deceived by a memoir is W.N.P. Barbellion’s *The Journal of a Disappointed Man* published in 1919. Its account of a talented young naturalist’s gradual decline from a then largely unknown disease deeply moved readers (Abbott *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* 31). The book’s final words were: “Barbellion died on December 31 [1917].” The memoir proved hugely popular, generating five printings in a few months but when readers learnt that Barbellion had not died but had “lived long enough to read the reviews of his life story, the feeling of betrayal was as deep as it was widespread, and the book fell into an obscurity from which it has rarely emerged” (Abbott 31). Frey, two years after the furore sparked by *A Million Little Pieces*, was still ambivalent about accepting responsibility for his deception of readers (Peretz “James Frey’s Morning After”). The gap between a book’s contents and its promotional claims is rarely as wide as Frey’s memoir or the Beardstown Ladies’ get rich quick book, as is evident in debate surrounding Benjamin Wilkomirski’s disputed account in *Fragments* of growing up a Holocaust survivor (Lappin “The Man with Two Heads”). Capote’s *In Cold Blood* has serious flaws, it is argued in this thesis, but would any reader have been able to bring a false advertising lawsuit against it on the ground, say, that Capote’s portrait of Smith was distorted? The laws of libel, then, serve to remind

practitioners of the care they need to take in representing people in books and consumer protection laws underline the seriousness with which at least some readers take a book's promotional copy and the need for practitioners to communicate clearly with them.

The law does not cover all the practitioner's ethical obligations to readers, however. Geoffrey Cowan, a professor of law and journalism, is well placed to weigh the interplay between the two fields ("The Legal and Ethical Limitations of Factual Misrepresentation" 155-64). No contract between journalists and their readers is spelt out in law, and nor should it be because of the protection of free speech in the first amendment to the American constitution. But freedom of speech, and by extension, the media, does not extend to inaccurate statements of fact that were made knowingly or with malice. Journalists have "an ethical duty of care to their audience. Readers and viewers have a real but unenforceable right to rely on the accuracy of what they learn through those media that they expect or believe to be accurate" (157). Cowan adds: "All storytellers know the difficulty of telling a story truthfully; each details skews the description – and can, if desired, skewer the subject" (156). The most effective antidote to selective fact is more fact, an idea that underlies the first amendment. Beyond selection, though, fundamentally inaccurate portrayals of people in the media can be dangerous, he writes, citing a docudrama entitled *Hoodlum* in which Thomas Dewey, the racket-busting district attorney and New York governor in the 1930s, was shown as a corrupt prosecutor, taking bribes from gangsters. Dewey's outraged heirs complained but had no legal recourse as the US Supreme Court had found in an earlier case that, in effect, the general public takes docudramas with a grain of salt (160).

Cowan does not propose a legal solution to these problems. Instead, he advocates the use of codes of ethics; these may be personal, corporate or industry-wide, and resemble Oakley and Cocking's regulative ideals (*Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles* 25-31). He also proposes that works be seen existing along a hypothetical continuum of "accuracy and balance." At one end are "entities that hold themselves out as reliable sources of information on the day's events" (162), such as daily newspapers, news magazines and works of non-fiction and history. At the other end are docudramas, films and plays based on fact that could include, say, Shakespeare's histories. In the middle are opinion pieces, openly ideological magazines and books

written with a clear point of view, such as Bill O'Reilly and Christopher Hitchens' work (See Appendix A). Even in docudramas, though, Cowan argues writers should not "invent scenes that did not happen if they distort the essence of the characters or of the story" and have a moral, if not a legal, responsibility to disclose to the audience the nature and extent of the distortion (162). Book-length journalism sits with non-fiction in Cowan's framework and is held to a high standard of accuracy and balance.

Cowan's framework supports Hersey's argument that readers understand that in journalism there will be at least some selection and omission and so can "hunt for bias" but "the moment the reader suspects additions, the earth begins to skid underfoot, for the idea that there is no way of knowing what is real and what is not real is terrifying. Even more terrifying is the notion that lies are truths" ("The Legend on the License" 249). Cowan's framework complements Doložel's use of possible worlds semantics discussed in chapter five; the latter provides a way of conceptualizing boundaries between fictional and factual narratives while the former pays heed to readers' differing expectations. The next layer of complexity to add, as envisaged in both Lehman's four part framework of reading non-fiction over the edge and in Oakley and Cocking's exposition of a virtue ethics approach in action, is that various readers respond and engage with various works of book-length journalism in various ways (*Matters of Fact* 36-37; *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles* 74-94). Applying their thinking specifically, I would argue that the majority of readers care a lot whether what they are reading is fiction or book-length journalism, but that some do not. I would argue most care about what they are reading if the people and events in the work are well known, even of historic importance, as in Woodward and Bernstein's two books about the Nixon presidency, and that fewer care if the people and events are publicly unknown or little known, as in Berendt's *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*. A variation on this theme occurs when works are read far from their origins in space or time; that is, Garner's *The First Stone* provoked passionate debates in Australia and especially Melbourne but was read through a different prism overseas, and probably would be read differently today, fourteen years after publication. Where readers have first hand knowledge of events and people depicted in a work, I would argue they care a great deal about whether the book is presented as fiction or book-length journalism.

Non-fiction books comprise a healthy proportion of total books published but there is limited empirical data about readers' expectations of non-fiction in general and book-length journalism in particular. In the United States, in 2004, a total of 190,078 books were published. Of these, 28,010 were novels and 47,718 were non-fiction books in the categories most likely to contain book-length journalism; that is, biography, history, law, sociology and economics, sport and travel, according to the industry publication, *Bookwire* (<http://www.bookwire.com/bookwire/decadebookproduction.html>). In Australia, in 2003-2004, fiction for adults accounted for fifteen per cent of total sales compared to thirty-six per cent of sales for trade non-fiction books, according to the industry publication, *Bookseller and Publisher* (<http://www.booksellerandpublisher.com.au/thinkaustrian>). There is not a lot of empirical evidence even about the ordinary reader's expectations of fiction, according to Milner. "We know that people read and we know that they read novels. What seems much less clear, however, is what exactly it is that they make of the books they read" (*Literature, Culture and Society* 184). Milner's focus is mainly on fiction, poetry and drama, but as he shows four out of five books sold each year in the United Kingdom are non-fiction (101). Nossek and Adoni surveyed 520 representative adults in Israel in 2001 about how various media forms – books, newspapers, television and the internet – "helped them to fulfil psycho-social needs" ("The Future of Reading" 105). One of the needs expressed was "to learn and enrich myself;" three out of four of those surveyed turned to books for this need, well ahead of the other forms which were used in this way by just over fifty per cent. The survey does not, however, distinguish between reading fiction and non-fiction books.

Recent empirical research conducted in Australia about attitudes toward deception in the news media is relevant to this thesis. Denis Muller, a former editorial executive at *The Sydney Morning Herald* and *The Age*, conducted quantitative surveys of three hundred randomly chosen voters in Victoria, Australia, and nearly one hundred and seventy self-selected journalists and journalism students for a PhD he completed in 2005 about accountability of the news media in a liberal democracy. Those surveyed were asked questions about five ethical scenarios, including: "Would you say it was always all right, never all right, or all right in some cases to pretend to be sympathetic to a person's situation in order to obtain an interview?" Of the voters

surveyed, only three per cent said it was always all right, twenty-six per cent said it was all right in some cases, and seventy per cent said it was never all right. By comparison, eleven per cent of journalists said it was always all right, fifty-seven per cent said it was all right in some cases, and only twenty-eight per cent said it was never all right. Muller comments: “There is a very large gulf between journalists and the community on what is regarded as ethical. People in the community are far less likely than journalists to say that these ethical breaches are justifiable in some circumstances” (117). His finding provides empirical support for Sissela Bok’s argument that in journalism “deception is taken for granted when it is felt to be excusable by those who tell the lies and who tend also to make the rules” (*Lying* xvii). Muller’s questions concerned daily rather than book-length journalism but they underscore the public’s dislike of deception in general and by journalists in particular. Muller’s research bears directly on the research phase of book-length journalism and indirectly on what journalists offer readers and on what terms.

The specific expectations readers have of book-length journalism are an important consideration for practitioners but not all-important. That is, the existence of readers who are unconcerned whether a work is book-length journalism or fiction does not absolve practitioners from their ethical obligations to readers, for two reasons: first, there are many readers who do care about the status of the work offered, and, second, practitioners’ ethical obligations to veracity in their works precedes the reader picking up the book. If the notion of a contract between practitioner and reader is inaccurate and implausible, Genette’s notion for autobiography that the “genre or other indications *commit* the author” (Italics in original *Paratexts* 11 footnote) is applicable to book-length journalism. Commits is a powerful word here as it attests to the practitioner’s ethical obligations. Practitioners commit to present their work in a particular way to readers who, in turn, place their trust in the practitioner. Readers do not sign contracts with practitioners but they do need to trust them if they care about the nature of what they are reading. Some readers will give (or withhold) trust regardless of what is presented, but for the majority their trust can be nourished through materials provided by practitioners. This could be within the body of the book, through the narrative voice or outside it in material such as endnotes, bibliographies, notes on sources, lists of interviewees and notes to the reader on whether practitioners witnessed events first hand. This practice extends to providing

information that would materially affect how readers read the work, such as any financial relationship between journalists and their principal sources. These practices amount to informed trust, which parallels the concept of informed consent between practitioners and principal sources discussed in chapter four. Among Boynton's interviewees, twelve describe the relationship they seek to establish with readers as one of trust or something similar. They are: Dash (71), Finnegan (99), Kotlowitz (152), Krakauer (180), Langewiesche (223), LeBlanc (245), Orlean (289), Rosenbaum (338-39), Schlosser (358), Trillin (401), Weschler (432) and Wright (454-55). Langewiesche's view is representative; he says practitioners need to be honest with readers, sometimes brutally so, as writing is a "private conversation" between practitioners and each individual reader: "It is a very intimate communication, which relies on trust. So it is crucial to establish that trust by never tricking the reader, never playing cute, never cajoling, showing off, or wasting the reader's time" (223). Among the Australian practitioners Bryson, Marr and Simons all invoke trust (Personal interviews); Simons comments that the "unreliable narrator," for years a source of rich interpretive interplay in fiction (Abbott *Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* 243; Herman *Cambridge Companion to Narrative* 282), is inappropriate in book-length journalism precisely because readers need to trust the practitioner's narrative voice. This includes even the narrative voice of practitioners like Didion, Mailer and Thompson who call attention to the difficulty of representing people and events (Personal interview).

To systematically analyse the elements practitioners need to consider in establishing an ethical relationship with readers, I draw on Genette's work about what he terms the paratext, which is material outside the body of the text, including titles, dedications, prefaces, and notes. He distinguishes between the peritext, which is paratextual material in the book, and the epitext, which takes in a potentially vast range of material that extends and comments on the text, such as the publisher's epitext (that is, promotional copy and posters), author interviews and reviews. Genette further distinguishes between the public and the private epitexts, which includes the author's correspondence and diaries (*Paratexts*). Genette's detailed categorizing of material that most readers and many critics have either taken for granted or overlooked is primarily aimed at fiction but it offers a rich and highly relevant framework for a critic of book-length journalism. Genette writes that the

main function of the paratext is “not to ‘look nice’ around the text but rather to ensure for the text a destiny consistent with the author’s purpose” (407). He acknowledges theoretical work questioning whether authors can ever really know their purpose, but says the author’s purpose sustains, inspires and anchors the paratextual performance. “The critic is by no means bound to subscribe to that viewpoint. I maintain only that, knowing it, he cannot completely disregard it, and if he wants to contradict it he must first assimilate it” (408-09).

Of particular relevance to book-length journalism is Genette’s discussion of how historians use prefaces. The original aim of the preface was to ensure that the text was “read properly” (197) and even though he discusses various ways in which authors have inverted or played with this original aim, Genette writes that historians strive for truthfulness or at the least sincerity in their preface. Historians and autobiographers, such as Montaigne, pledge that their books have been written in good faith; historians reinforce their pledge by outlining their methods. Thucydides, for example, maintains that he relies only on direct observation and corroborated testimony (206). The similarity here between historians and practitioners of book-length journalism is obvious. Genette’s description of the author’s view of publisher’s promotional material appears snobbish – “most often he is satisfied just to close his eyes officially to the value-inflating hyperbole inseparable from the needs of trade” (347). Writing in the 1980s, in France, Genette’s notion that authors are absolved from any responsibility in marketing their book does not apply to many authors in the United States and Australia in the 21st century, but even as far back as the 1960s Capote defended the dust-jacket copy for *In Cold Blood* as “thoughtfully written” in its claims about the non-fiction novel, which implied that he had written it himself or at the least approved it (*Inge Truman Capote: Conversations* 120).

When journalists move from newspapers and magazines to books they enjoy more freedom to shape their project but also take on more responsibility as it is their name on the book’s cover rather than their newspaper or magazine’s masthead. The paradox in publishing is that while books, even in the internet age, carry cultural weight as a source of reliable information, most publishers do not fact-check books and the onus for verifying the contents falls mainly to the journalist. A further paradox is that the time journalists spend on book-length projects means their work should be more accurate than daily journalism, but most publishers are less

experienced with prospective libel suits. These paradoxes go to the question of what is actually presented to readers. Vernacular expressions may suggest readers' preconceptions. The term *journalese* not only rhymes with *sleaze* but connotes threadbare or euphemistic language. The terms *authority* and *authoritative* derive from the word *author*, which is bound to books. Perceptions and vernacular expressions bear further scrutiny, however. Where newspaper and magazine journalism is produced by a team of practitioners that incorporates several layers of checking and editing, book-length journalism is primarily the work of one person, or occasionally two as in Woodward and Bernstein. As I have argued elsewhere, despite the solidity and respectability surrounding publishing houses, there is an alarmingly thin tradition of fact-checking in publishing ("The Awkward Truth" 51-55).

Finding and verifying contentious information is central to the operation of news organizations. Newsrooms have numerous experienced journalists and editors who have developed a keen sense of scepticism because being baldly lied to is endemic to the practice of daily journalism. Newspapers retain the services of specialist media lawyers because they face the prospect of defamation actions daily. Publishing houses draw on lawyers too but the threat of defamation, with its likelihood of sizeable payouts, is not as central to their business. Questions about the systems publishers use to verify book-length journalism and other non-fiction works, such as memoirs, have been raised for several years, notably in *Brill's Content* and *Columbia Journalism Review*. Weinberg surveyed book-length journalism and found book publishers tend to view writers as "suppliers of information, which the publisher then markets, as a grocer markets the farmer's eggs" ("Why Books Err so Often" 52). Lemann agrees, adding that many journalists are shocked to learn how little fact-checking is done in publishing houses and publishers are "surprised by that shock" as they "seem to think of themselves as *purveyors* of literary material, not producers, assigners or shapers of it" (Italics in original "What About Endnotes?" 192; see also Goldstein *Journalism and Truth* 135-37). Errors made in newspapers and magazines reflect on the publication's credibility; errors made in books are more likely to reflect on the individual journalist's credibility than on their publisher. Most journalists value their credibility and that, combined with the threat of libel suits, acts as an incentive to verify material in books, but the additional time devoted to a book

project needs to be weighed against its scope – probably ninety thousand words compared to nine hundred – and the usually meagre support for fact-checking.

Sarah Harrison Smith worked as a fact-checker at *The New Yorker* before becoming head of fact-checking at *The New York Times Magazine*; she has written a book entitled *The Fact Checker's Bible* in which she argues that non-fiction books are not automatically rigorously checked (35-37); this even applies to some reference books (150-51). She quotes David Brock, who, several years after writing a biography of the former first lady, Hillary Clinton, confessed:

All authors of big non-fiction books face the arduous task of generating headlines to spur book sales. Too often, authors succumb to market pressures by trafficking in rumour, using unreliable sources, or embellishing their material, all in the service of hype and buzz. Publishing houses are notoriously lax in fact-checking. Books are rarely retracted or even corrected” (36).

In Australia, a similar minimalist approach to fact-checking has been the norm according to Webster and Grant (Personal interviews). Controversies surrounding two memoirs, Norma Khouri's *Forbidden Lies* in 2004 and Ishmael Beah's *A Long Way Gone* in 2008, have prompted at least some soul-searching and marginally more rigorous checking procedures. Even so, at Random House in Australia, publisher of Khouri's book, the managing director, Margaret Seale, says ideally all facts would be checked but “We are not journalists. We do not have the resources and books would be much more expensive if we did” (Hope “Loose with the Truth”). Some journalists, such as Preston in *The Demon in the Freezer* (Acknowledgements), Rosenbaum, in *Explaining Hitler* (426), and Schlosser in *Fast Food Nation* (336), draw on the work of fact-checkers though it is not clear from the acknowledgments in their books whether they or their publishers paid for them.

There may be considerable overlap between readers of books and readers of newspapers and magazines (not to mention broadcast and online media), but readers are exposed to and perceive these industries differently. Newspapers and magazines are mass media that attract readers by their variety of offerings, by their being fresh daily, weekly or monthly which creates a reading habit, and by a relatively cheap

cover price that is subsidized by advertising. Books, by comparison, are one-off discretionary purchases that need to appeal to the reader then and there in the bookshop. They cost considerably more than newspapers but they are to print media what “pay-per-view” is to television, as Simons puts it (*The Content Makers* 125). That books are not reliant on paid advertising has provided an environment in which some of the best journalism in Australia has been published in book-form, she argues, citing Masters’ *Jonestown* and Marr and Wilkinson’s *Dark Victory* (126). Orlean, a longtime staff writer at *The New Yorker* and author of two works of book-length journalism, says: “Books give you much more freedom, more of a chance to be unconventional. The book rises or falls on its own ability to appeal to an audience, rather than a magazine’s need to sell itself to an advertiser” (Boynton *The New New Journalism* 291). Buyers and, for that matter, borrowers of books, then, do not have the kind of strong, pre-existing relationship with a work of book-length journalism that they customarily have with newspapers and magazines (Cords *The Real Story* xxii). With a few notable exceptions, such as Thompson, Wolfe and in Australia, Garner, readers do not buy a work of book-length journalism because it was written by a particular journalist. Some works of book-length journalism were first published as magazine articles but once put between the covers of a book their origins are forgotten by most or relegated to a note on the publication details page.

It may be possible to gain further insight into the relationship practitioners have with readers by examining how such books are promoted to potential buyers. I acknowledge promotional copy will not convey the work’s complexity – that is what the actual content is for, after all – and that promotional copy is explicitly aimed at enticing a potential buyer but I argue that promotional copy is a useful guide to the grounds on which the relationship between journalist and reader begins, or at least is proposed. Author interviews and other publicity for a work, such as appearances at writers’ festivals, also help position the book in readers’ minds, but not all books attract publicity whereas all carry dust-jacket copy. It needs to be remembered that while a book is a product many works of book-length journalism engage in revelation and debate about events, issues and people. These works are not a carton of eggs, as Weinberg reminds us, but a particular kind of product that plays an important role in a liberal democracy. Some genres of non-fiction books, such as true crime, sport, travel and biography, have their own drawing power for readers even

before any particular marketing campaign is launched. With this in mind, I propose there are seven main grounds on which the relationship between journalist and reader is proposed. These grounds have been gleaned from analysing the promotional copy on the covers of a range of works of book-length journalism that includes: bestsellers on the *Publishers Weekly* and *Nielsen BookScan* lists (Appendices A and E), Pulitzer Prize winners for general non-fiction (Appendix D), the list of notable works of Australian book-length journalism (Appendix G), works by journalists interviewed for Boynton's *The New New Journalism* and those by Australian practitioners interviewed for this thesis. The majority of works examined have been published in the past decade but some earlier works, notably *In Cold Blood* and *The Final Days*, have also been examined. I have looked at promotional copy for the first edition, which represents the original promise to readers, but this has not always been possible as university libraries generally remove dust-jackets before making books available for loan. Some of the books I own, however. Sometimes promotional copy for later editions use a book's status as a "classic," which may be an attraction for potential buyers, but does not add anything substantial to the analysis of promotional copy.

The seven main grounds on which the relationship between practitioner and reader is proposed are: first, the book is true; second, it reads like a novel; third, it has new information; fourth, the book is about a major event, person or issue that is preoccupying the public; fifth, the book promises to take the reader "inside" an event or issue; sixth it is by a well known individual journalist or author, and seventh it is about or in some way touches on celebrity. All but one of these grounds – it reads like a novel – is common in newspaper and magazine journalism. It is this ground, usually combined with the first – the book is true – that can both make book-length journalism so readable and also poses ethical problems that require discussion in this thesis. Sometimes books combine a perennially popular topic, such as crime or sport, with one of the seven grounds. For instance, Cramer's biography of Joe DiMaggio promises new information about the American baseball legend. The dust-jacket copy of the first hardback edition, published in 2000, reads: "This is the story Joe DiMaggio never wanted to tell – and never wanted anyone else to tell. It is the story of his grace – and greed: his dignity, pride – and hidden shame."

To explicate the seven grounds proposed further, an example of the first is Krakauer's *Into Thin Air*, published in 1997. Promotional copy from the book's 1998 paperback edition reads:

On May 9th 1996, five expeditions launched an assault on the summit of Mount Everest. The conditions seemed perfect. Twenty-four hours later one climber had died and 23 other men and women were caught in a desperate struggle for their lives as they battled against a ferocious storm that threatened to tear them from the mountain. In all eight climbers died that day in the worst tragedy Everest has ever seen.

The proposal, or pitch to use the language of marketing, is that the book is about extraordinary or dramatic or seemingly unbelievable events, as are Junger's *The Perfect Storm* and Blackburn's *Broken Lives*. An example of the second reason is Read's *Alive: The Story of the Andes Survivors*, an account of a plane crash in the Andes mountains in 1972 where survivors were forced to choose whether to eat those who had died. The promotional copy for the original edition reads:

How these young men finally sent out 'expeditionaries' to brave the Andean peaks and how, after appalling hardships, they achieved rescue and a return to civilization 72 days after the crash is one of the epic adventures of our time, a tale of human courage and triumph almost unequalled in this century. Piers Paul Read makes this deeply moving story *read like a great novel*, yet every word of it is true (Italics added).

An example of how the first two grounds can be combined is Ken Follett's *On Wings of Eagles*, which recounts how an ex-Green Beret and a team of corporate executives from the company owned by billionaire Ross Perot, Electronic Data Systems, rescued two company executives taken hostage from the company's office in Iran in 1978. Originally published in 1983 and one of the top ten bestselling non-fiction books of that year, the dust-jacket copy of the 1998 paperback edition begins: "The story on these pages would have been incredibly exciting had it been fiction. But it is more than that – it is fact. It's a story that only Ken Follett, today's master of action

and suspense, could do justice to.” In a preface, Follett, a bestselling novelist, declares: “This is not a ‘fictionalization,’ a ‘non-fiction novel.’ Nothing has been invented. What you read is what really happened” (xii). The promotional copy, which explicitly describes the events in the book as “the stuff of Follett’s fiction,” promises the reader, then, they will be able to enjoy all the pleasures of fiction with none of what Marr calls the “raggedness” of non-fiction (Personal interview).

An example of the third ground is Conover’s *Newjack*, published in 2000.

Promotional copy for the 2001 paperback edition reads:

When Ted Conover’s request to shadow a recruit at the New York State Corrections Academy was denied, he decided to apply for a job as a prison officer himself. The result is an unprecedented work of eyewitness journalism: the account of Conover’s year-long passage into storied Sing Sing prison as a rookie guard, or ‘newjack.’

New information may be conceived more broadly than new facts; that is, the appeal of some books is that they provide new information about a familiar issue that enables readers to see it afresh, such as Schlosser’s *Fast Food Nation*, published in 2001, whose promotional copy for the first paperback edition published in England reads:

You are what you eat. But do you *really* know what you’re eating?...This myth-shattering book tells the story of America and the world’s infatuation with fast food, from its origins in 1950s southern California to the global triumph of a handful of burger and fried chicken chains” (Italics in original).

An example of the fourth ground proposed is Langewiesche’s *American Ground*, published in 2002. The promotional copy for the first edition published in England, in 2003, reads:

William Langewiesche was the only journalist given unrestricted access to what became known as Ground Zero – the eleven stories of twisted metal and compressed concrete that had been 110 stories of

the World Trade Center. He arrived within days of September 11 2001 and left after the final ceremony in May 2002.

Other examples of books about major events include Hersey's *Hiroshima* and Philip Gourevitch's *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with Our Families: Stories from Rwanda* about the genocide in Rwanda in 1994. The fifth ground proposed goes to the journalist's promise to take the reader "inside" an event or issue. This promise is the force driving most of Woodward's books. The tagline on the front cover of the paperback edition of his book *Plan of Attack*, published in 2004, is "The Definitive Account of the Decision to Invade Iraq" and the promotional copy on the back reads:

Plan of Attack delivers an astonishingly intimate portrait of President George W. Bush, his war council and allies as they launch a preemptive strike on Iraq, toppling Saddam Hussein and occupying the country. Woodward's fly-on-the-wall account reveals the secret meetings, key decisions, conflicts and raw emotions of war as they are rarely seen in contemporary history.

Another example is Bryan Burrough and John Helyar's *Barbarians at the Gate*, published in 1990. Promotional copy for the first paperback edition, published the same year, promises a "gripping narrative" that takes readers inside the board room of RJR Nabisco to reveal "the truth behind a Wall Street gamble" – namely the biggest corporate takeover in American history. Where a novelist may offer to transport the reader to their imagined world, here the journalist promises to take readers into parts of the actual world to which they do not have access.

The sixth ground proposed combines readers' following of particular authors and their enjoyment of true stories; with the exception of star journalists such as Woodward, this reason mainly turns on the drawing power of novelists writing book-length journalism. Mailer is the most obvious example in the United States. The equivalent in Australia is Garner; when *Joe Cinque's Consolation* was published in 2004 her name was printed in type almost twice the size for that of the title. The promotional copy outlines the case concerning Joe Cinque but it, too, is in type half the size of the promotional tagline that reads: "A masterwork from one of Australia's

greatest writers.” Where practitioners are not well known it is common for publishers to highlight their role as a journalist, as in Karen Kissane’s *Silent Death* and Kimina Lyall’s *Out of the Blue*, or if they work for a well known newspaper or magazine to draw attention to that association, as in *Cold New World* and *The Orchid Thief*, both of whose biographical notes mention prominently that Finnegan and Orlean are staff writers for *The New Yorker*.

Finally, just as a minority of journalists and novelists-cum-journalists attract followings, so the widespread phenomenon of celebrities in modern society is a particular ground proposed that is most often found in biographies, especially of those still alive, as I have argued elsewhere (“The Reporting Is All” 18-19). Prominent examples include Michael Crick’s excoriation of the bestselling novelist and political figure Jeffrey Archer entitled *Stranger Than Fiction*, published in 1995, and Kitty Kelley’s unauthorized biography of singer and friend-of-the-Mafia, Frank Sinatra, entitled *His Way* and published in 1986. The book’s pitch was summed up in William Safire’s excerpted review on the back cover of the 1987 paperback edition, which reads: “The most eye-opening celebrity biography of our time.” These examples show how the seven grounds can be clearly identified, but what happens when practitioners are ambiguous about the terms of the relationship proposed with readers? Thomas Keneally was so worried his book on Oskar Schindler would be classified as Judaica and shelved at the back of bookshops that he asked for it to be classified as fiction (*Searching for Schindler* 162). The promotional copy of the original hardback edition, published in 1982, emphasises Keneally’s background as a novelist and promises to take “us back into Nazi-occupied Poland, from where an extraordinary tale emerges – of an extraordinary man’s mission to save the Jewish people.” Inside, in an author’s note, Keneally writes that his book is a true story and that he has “attempted to avoid all fiction” but also that he has used “the texture and devices of a novel” (*Schindler’s Ark* 9-11). *Schindler’s Ark* is non-fiction, then, but it won the Booker prize for fiction in 1982 (*Searching for Schindler* 168), which formalized the confusion even when there seemed little need for it. Keneally came to regret his decision when Holocaust deniers used the book’s classification as evidence supporting their poisonous views (162).

To sum up, the grounds on which the relationship is proposed suggest readers of book-length journalism expect to learn something new and to be entertained, in

roughly equal proportions. If their primary expectation was learning something new, they would read a textbook; if their primary expectation was entertainment, the content of the book would be secondary. To the extent that the new information is a matter of urgent public interest (for example, how emergency workers dealt with the World Trade Center's destruction by terrorist attack), the reader is better placed to fulfil their role as a citizen in a democracy. To the extent the book is entertaining, that too is an important though often undervalued part of journalism's role – and appeal. To the extent that the book is emotionally as well as intellectually engaging, that may well shift readers' perspectives on an issue or event that, again, helps them fulfil their role as citizens. If there are some works of book-length journalism where the weight of expectation tilts toward the content and importance of the information, such as Langewiesche's *American Ground*, there are others, such as Berendt's *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*, where the emphasis is on entertainment. The range of book-length journalism is an extension of the news media industry; both industries publish work that is in the public interest, and both publish work that aims simply to entertain. The ethical issues concerning a book's reception by the public may become visible more often if it is about a public interest issue and may be more urgent because a book about, say, a dishonest president concerns society as a whole but ethical issues can still arise in primarily entertaining books because they still purport to depict actual events and people and these people merit ethical treatment.

A prime example of such issues arising in an entertaining work of book-length journalism is in fact Berendt's *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*, which combines a travelogue about Savannah, Georgia, and its eccentric, exotic inhabitants, with a courtroom drama about a murder trial. It is written in a narrative mode that encourages the reader to read as if it was a novel. The promotional copy of the front flap of the original hardback edition begins:

Shots rang out in Savannah's grandest mansion in the misty, early morning hours of May 2, 1981. Was it murder or self-defense? John Berendt's sharply observed, suspenseful and witty narrative reads like a thoroughly engrossing novel, and yet it is a work of nonfiction....It is a spellbinding story peopled by a gallery of remarkable

characters....*Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil* is a sublime and seductive reading experience.

The copy says the book is non-fiction yet the weight of the pitch falls on the book's novel-like qualities – “engrossing,” “spellbinding,” and “sublime and seductive reading experience” (http://www.amazon.com/Midnight-Garden-Good-Evil-Berendt/dp/0679429220/ref=sr_1_1/182-4595968-3505607?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1243318112&sr=1-1#reader). In a three sentence author's note, Berendt writes: “Though this is a work of nonfiction, I have taken certain storytelling liberties, particularly having to do with the timing of events. Where the narrative strays from strict nonfiction, my intention has been to remain faithful to the characters and to the essential drift of events as they really happened.” This note appeared after the body of the book; in all likelihood, readers would not have seen it until after they finished the book and Berendt, an experienced magazine journalist and editor, gave readers no specific information about the “certain storytelling liberties” he had taken. Later research by journalists and a journalism academic revealed a number of factual errors, some minor, others more important; there was some fabricated dialogue, which Berendt terms “rounding the corners to make a better narrative,” an undisclosed contract with the man charged, and eventually cleared, of murder, and accusations of Berendt using stories people told him without confirming details with others because they had the “folkloric quality” he wanted for his book (Dufresne “Why *Midnight* May be Darker Than You Think” 78-79).

These matters go to the research and writing phase of Berendt's work, but the most serious problem in how Berendt establishes his relationship with readers is that he places a version of himself in the book four years before he actually arrived in Savannah. He describes himself witnessing an argument between the main person in the book, Jim Williams, and the young hustler who worked for him, Danny Hansford; he describes himself attending the first two of the four trials of Williams for the murder of Hansford, and he describes himself at a midnight voodoo ritual with Williams from which the book's title emerges (Dufresne 78). He even describes a sexual encounter between Hansford and a young woman in the most intimate detail: “She breathed the salty smell of his T-shirt and felt his belt buckle rubbing against her stomach” (*Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil* 132). Questioned

about this, Berendt says the woman, Corinne, recounted the event in every particular (Ricketson “After Midnight” 4 November 1995). Not only does the ten page scene (130-132, 135-141) rely on one person’s memory, but it is written to place the reader literally in the bedroom, and it reads like a bodice-ripping romance novel. All this appears to be what Berendt meant by “certain storytelling liberties” but if the sex scene is tacky and its detail unnecessary, the time-shifting is more accurately described as deception. A later film adaptation, starring John Cusack as Berendt and Kevin Spacey as Williams, perpetuated these deceptions on screen.

Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil stayed on *The New York Times* non-fiction bestseller list for a then record 186 weeks and was shortlisted for a Pulitzer Prize in general non-fiction in 1995 but did not win. John Carroll, editor of *The Baltimore Sun* and a member of the Pulitzer board at the time, said: “There’s some fabrication in it” that meant “as a journalist I’m not prepared to call it nonfiction” (Dufresne 79). Some people in Savannah were unconcerned by Berendt’s “storytelling liberties,” including Jim Williams’ attorney, Sonny Seiler, who said the book would have been boring without them. “Someone’s got to put a spin on it.” Conversely, Williams’ sister, Dorothy Kingery, a sociologist, complained about the “enormous liberties,” about how Berendt “grossly exaggerated” her brother’s reliance on voodoo rituals and about the “great blurring of fiction and nonfiction” in the book (Dufresne 79). After the book’s initial success and in response to some complaints, Berendt moved his author’s note to the front of the book for later editions. In the new note dated April 1996 he acknowledges some had read the book thinking it was fiction rather than non-fiction (“Preface to this edition” vii-viii). His moving of the note put the reader “on notice” but Berendt does not specify or discuss the central deception of his readers, namely writing as if he was present at events when he was not. In the revised note even his coy acknowledgement that he had taken “certain storytelling liberties” is excluded, which means that in some ways he made matters worse.

The new note is almost two pages rather than three sentences but is self-serving. Berendt affirms the existence of the exotic people he portrayed and that despite publicity the book brought the city, Savannah somehow remains both unspoiled and improved by the tourists flooding the city in the book’s wake – a line that reads more like a PR agent rather than a journalist. Berendt even points to the novelist Philip Roth’s notion expressed by his narrator, a novelist, in *The Counterlife* that “people

don't turn themselves over to writers as full-blown literary characters." Most people are "absolutely unoriginal" and it is the novelist's job "to make them appear otherwise." By contrast, Berendt writes that he was blessed to find people in Savannah who were already "full blown literary characters" and "absolutely compelling without any help from me" (vii). Given that Berendt had already admitted to not checking details because his interviewees had the "folkloric quality" he wanted, this is simply disingenuous. *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil* was and is labeled as non-fiction, though in later printings its back cover lists it with the slightly ambiguous label of "crime/travel." Much of the book's appeal is bound up with the reader's delight that so many exotic people telling so many outlandish stories could actually be living in the one city, and of the reader being drawn into the drama of events because they see them from the point of view of someone – Berendt – who says he was there as they unfolded. Berendt, it seems, succumbed to what Kramer calls a "moment of temptation" when the journalist realizes that "tweaking reality could sharpen the meaning or flow of a scene" ("Breakable Rules for Literary Journalists" 25). The book may have been written primarily as beguiling beach reading (Ricketson "After Midnight"), but its fictionalizing misrepresents various people and weakens its veracity; Berendt abuses the trust placed in him by readers. It may well be that some are unfussed whether the people and events described are factual or fictional but Berendt treats all his readers as dupes.

For those works of book-length journalism about well-known people and events, it is less likely readers would be ignorant of or unconcerned about the truth-telling claims made, but here the question is how can practitioners demonstrate the veracity of their work to readers. In Woodward's work, the core ethical issue of how he represents people and events is magnified by how he uses paratextual material. In the previous chapter I argued that the gap between the omniscient narrative voice and the highly contested events written about had the effect of straining some readers' credulity while pandering to other readers' voyeuristic tendencies. In the paratextual material surrounding Woodward's books, there is a parallel gap between the sweeping promises made to the reader and the thinness of the material assuring the reader of the book's veracity. The dust jacket of the first hardback edition of *The Final Days* describes the book as follows:

In an enthralling narrative that flashes from one private discussion to the next, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein chronicle the previously unknown events leading to the resignation of President Richard Nixon. This is a story you have not read in the newspapers...

The authors accomplish what no other reporters have: they take us inside the rooms where Nixon's tapes were made and edited; where the President, his lawyers and staff committed themselves to increasingly desperate tactics to save the Nixon presidency...

Here is the moment-by-moment account of Richard Nixon's last days in public office – brought vividly alive with the *same novelistic detail* and dialogue that made *All the President's Men* a number one national best seller (Italics added).

The promotional copy uses several of the elements listed above to appeal to the reader: the book is true, it is about important events and people, it will give the reader the “inside” story and it reads like a novel.

The paratextual material consists of a half page of acknowledgements, a dedication to partners and to sources, a one paragraph authors' note acknowledging the contribution of two researcher/writers, a “cast of characters,” a four page chronology, an index and a three page foreword. The last named item is the journalists' explanation of their method and justification for their reliance on anonymous sources. They write that they interviewed 394 people, some of them for dozens of hours; many interviewees supplied contemporaneous notes, memoranda, correspondence, logs, calendars and diaries. In exchange for granting anonymity, sources “were willing to give us information we would never otherwise have been able to obtain.” As mentioned in the previous chapter, they write that they interviewed one or more participants in meetings they describe and resolved differences in various people's accounts by re-interviewing. (*The Final Days* 11-13).

The three page foreword is asked to bear the burden of establishing the journalists' veracity, though it should be recalled that at the time Woodward and Bernstein's reputation was at its highest, on the strength of their Watergate reporting. There is some confusion about the number of interviewees, even though an exact figure is

given. In the Woodward and Bernstein archives at the University of Texas, Woodward wrote in an undated draft of the foreword that more than seven hundred interviews were conducted but that “the bulk of the information came from 65 people” (Shepard 126). These discrepancies could be explicable – perhaps the seven hundred figure refers to the total number of interviews regardless of person – but they weaken the confidence a reader today has in the book. There is a very big distance between sixty-five people and 394, and, of course, at the time readers were given only one figure. By comparison, Lukas’s *Nightmares* carries an eleven page note on sources broken down chapter by chapter that includes reference to specific documents and books, comments on the veracity of source material and, importantly, lists and names of interviewees (570-80). The note on sources is more expansive, then, than Woodward and Bernstein’s and explicitly states the difficulty in writing about Nixon’s demise is “in sifting truth from this surfeit of incomplete, self-serving and conflicting data” (570).

Despite the suggestion on the dust jacket that *The Final Days* adopted the same narrative approach as *All the President’s Men*, there was a marked difference in reception to the books. The two journalists’ first book was almost universally praised by critics and generated hundreds of letters according to Shepard, most of which read like “love letters” to the nation’s two new heroes (95). By contrast, *The Final Days* was vehemently attacked by numerous critics on three main grounds – that the book was disrespectful of the Nixon family’s private life, that it was written as an “omniscient narrative” and that the sources were anonymous (144-46). Readers who had applauded the “investigative efforts of Messrs. Woodward & Bernstein” now saw them as “pair of gossipy little men” (145). A number of those included in *The Final Days* came forward to contest the book’s veracity; some complaints could be dismissed as self-serving but others could not. Three Nixon aides disputed Republican senator Barry Goldwater’s anecdote about Nixon being incoherently drunk at a dinner at the White House. One of the aides, speechwriter Ray Price, said he and his two colleagues all told Woodward and Bernstein that the anecdote was incorrect but “they used it anyway” (Havill *Deep Truth* 113). Kissinger complained to Woodward and Bernstein’s editor at *The Washington Post*, Ben Bradlee: “Just how did they know what I was thinking?” (Havill 116). More seriously perhaps, Mrs Pat Nixon suffered a stroke, reportedly just after reading the book; this prompted her

husband to seriously consider suing but he was dissuaded on the grounds of cost and difficulty and, perversely, prompting even more sales of the already bestselling book (Havill 112)

The key elements of the paratext in Woodward's succeeding books have remained largely unchanged: a note on the use of anonymous sources, acknowledgement of his current research assistant/s, an index but not endnotes or bibliography. But where he defended (albeit briefly) the use of anonymous sources in *The Final Days*, in later books he simply states that he draws on them. Later books, though, do explicitly say that where thoughts and feelings are attributed to people he has obtained them "from that person directly, from the written record, or from a colleague whom the person told" (*State of Denial*. 493; see also *Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA 1981-1987* 13; *Plan of Attack* x) *State of Denial*, Woodward's third book about the Bush presidency, does contain twenty-nine pages of endnotes, which improves its level of transparency for readers. Some interviewees, such as Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, are named but most are still not and by the time Woodward wrote *State of Denial* Rumsfeld was embattled and would soon to be forced to resign; that is, as Rumsfeld's power declined Woodward had less need to protect him as a source. There is, then, a clear through-line in the ethical issues arising in Woodward's book-length journalism that begins in the research phase where he has made anonymous sources his touchstone, but has resolved none of the tensions inherent in the practice. The issue is magnified in the writing phase by his writing in an omniscient narrative voice where he could have signposted the difficulties of reporting and interpreting major political events. The problem is cemented in the relationship he establishes with readers, which amounts to: trust me, I'm Bob Woodward. "Well I don't" is the response of Ken Fuson, a journalist with the Des Moines Register, and he is by no means a lone voice (Lorenz "When You Weren't There" 491)

The sophisticated media campaign announcing the arrival of each new Woodward book is part of the modern media landscape (Shepard *Woodward and Bernstein* 227-28), but the blizzard of media attention Capote generated when *In Cold Blood* was published in January 1966 was extraordinary. Where Woodward has always identified himself as a journalist, Capote was seen as a writer when the word still carried a capital 'W,' according to his biographer, Clarke, who says Capote was one of the first writers in the United States to understand and make use of the mass media

for an avowedly literary project. If the five years between Smith and Hickock's conviction and their execution frustrated Capote, it also served to build prospective readers' anticipation to fever pitch. The promotional copy on the dust-jacket of the first edition published in the United States and in England could confidently announce the book "has already been hailed as a masterpiece."

(http://www.amazon.com/s/ref=nb_ss_b?url=search-alias%3Dstripbooks&field-keywords=in+cold+blood+first+edition&x=12&y=19)

In 1966 Capote was the subject of twelve articles in national magazines, several of which featured his picture on the cover, two half-hour television programs and numerous radio and newspaper interviews; he was the first writer to be asked to appear on television's *Meet the Press*, a program usually reserved for politicians and statesmen. *Life* magazine ran eighteen pages about *In Cold Blood*, the most space it had ever devoted to a professional writer. "Such a deluge of words and picture has never before been poured out over a book," *The New York Times* reported (Clarke *Capote* 362-63).

Capote, the spinner of stories since boyhood, transfixed interviewer after interviewer with his story of the making of *In Cold Blood*. There were three main threads to his public epitextual narrative: first, the immense labour of his research; second, what he endured to write the book, and third, that he had created a new art form (Inge *Truman Capote: Conversations* 38-163; Stanton *Truman Capote: A Primary and Secondary Bibliography* 131-74). Partly, this was strategic on his part; the events of the book were, sadly, relatively common in America and their outcome well known, but the epitext also illustrated the scale of Capote's ambition and his egocentricity. As Clarke remarks: "He told the tale of his nearly six-year ordeal so often that it almost became part of the national lore, like Washington's chopping down the cherry tree" (363). Capote's story-behind-the-story was not, like Washington's cherry tree-logging, apocryphal, but he certainly exaggerated, and, in parts, to put it bluntly, lied. In numerous interviews Capote trumpeted the accuracy of his work and the near infallibility of his memory that had enabled him to interview people without taking notes. "One doesn't spend almost six years on a book, the point of which is factual accuracy, and then give way to minor distortions," he sniffed to Plimpton, himself a practitioner of book-length journalism as well as founding editor of *The Paris Review* ("The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel" 62).

It might be argued Capote's emphasis on his accuracy was a way of reassuring prospective readers as *In Cold Blood* contained no endnotes, index or notes on sources even though the book's sub-title is "A True Account of a Multiple Murder and Its Consequences." There is a half page of acknowledgements before the body of the book, that reads: "All the material in this book not derived from my own observation is either taken from official records or is the result of interviews with the persons directly concerned, more often than not numerous interviews conducted over a considerable period of time." This is slightly more than readers of the original four part series in *The New Yorker* were given. At the top of each part, under the headline and before the opening paragraph, is the following: "Editor's note: all quotations in this article are taken either from official records or from conversations, transcribed verbatim, between the author and the principals." (25 September 1965 57; 2 October 1965 57; 9 October 1965 58; 16 October 1965 62). By saying the conversations were transcribed verbatim, the editor's note promises a level of precision that Shawn could not have, and actually doubted Capote had (Yagoda *About Town* 347-48).

In the previous chapter, some of the inaccuracies and distortions of *In Cold Blood* were discussed. Here, what needs to be highlighted is the discrepancy between Capote's repeated claims in promotional interviews and documented sources. In one interview he said he had spent seven months in Kansas after the murders but it was actually just one (Newquist "Truman Capote" 42; Clarke *Capote* 320; Clarke *Too Brief a Treat* 276; Shields *Mockingbird* 132, 175). In several interviews Capote played up the thousands of pages of research notes he had taken before sitting down to write but though 6000 pages was the figure commonly mentioned (Garson *Truman Capote* 142; Nance *The Worlds of Truman Capote* 176; Reed *Truman Capote* 103), his biographer lists it as 4000 pages (Clarke *Capote* 331) and in the private epitext, his letters, Capote refers to 4000 pages in July 1960 (*Too Brief a Treat* 288) but early the following year that figure has shrunk to 2000 (310). In another interview Capote misremembered the headline of *The New York Times* article that had prompted his interest in the Clutter murders. It was "Wealthy Farmer, 3 of Family Slain" but Capote recalled it as "Eisenhower Appointee Murdered" (Newquist "Truman Capote" 41). Herb Clutter had been appointed to the Federal Farm Credit Board by President Eisenhower but that information was contained not in the headline but in the fifth paragraph of the news report

(<http://www.nytimes.com/books/97/12/28/home/capote-headline.html>). It is not a substantial error but the *Times*' article was a key part of the backstory of *In Cold Blood* and, as the English critic Kenneth Tynan tartly notes, Capote repeatedly claimed in interviews that he had trained himself to remember long conversations but the percentage figure he gave for this near perfect accuracy wandered between 92, 95 and 97 per cent (*Tynan Right and Left* 442).

What is a more substantive matter is the discrepancy between the private and the public epitext over whether Capote was waiting until the execution of Smith and Hickock to finish his book. Soon after the book's publication, Tynan, writing in *The Observer* in London, questioned Capote's ethics on the ground that "For the first time, an influential writer of the front rank has been placed in a position of privileged intimacy with criminals about to die, and – in my view – done less than he might have to save them." He suggested a third meaning for the book's title – the cold-bloodedness of the author (*Tynan Right and Left* 445). Capote defended himself vigorously, saying Tynan's argument was not only incorrect but that he had "the morals of a baboon and the guts of a butterfly" (Tynan 451). Capote was probably right that it was not in his power to do anything more for Smith and Hickock but Tynan had hit a raw nerve – Capote did not want to save them. Smith had told Capote in an interview before the murder trial that he had cut Herb Clutter's throat (Capote papers, Box 7, Folder 9), and as early as April 1961 Capote told the Deweys he had "reached a point in my book where I must know how the books ends!" (*Too Brief a Treat* 314). But Capote did not acknowledge this publicly. Instead, he told an interviewer that "as the years dragged on and the legal delays and complications multiplied, I still didn't know if I was going to be able to finish the book or even if there was any book there" (Norden "Playboy Interview" 123).

In 1979 De Bellis analysed the production history of *In Cold Blood* and found that between its publication in *The New Yorker* and in book form ten weeks later Capote made more than five thousand ("Visions and Revisions" 519-36). More than a third of these were matters of punctuation. Some phrases appear to have been made more colloquial, but that could be explained by the restraints imposed by *New Yorker* editor William Shawn's notorious prudishness (Yagoda *About Town* 296). For an author who claimed to be obsessed with accuracy, though, Capote proves surprisingly slipshod, especially considering the length of time he had worked on the

manuscript and the oft-remarked status of *The New Yorker's* fact-checking department. Late in the book Capote quotes the ninth stanza of Thomas Gray's "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard" but has introduced two changes ("boasts" becomes "boast" and "awaits" becomes "await") even though the version in *The New Yorker* agrees with the best bibliographic sources (De Bellis 529). Similarly, Capote changes the position of tattoos on Smith and Hickock's arms for the Random House edition even though photographs taken by Richard Avedon of the convicted murderers for *The New Yorker* show the original magazine copy was accurate (532). Capote even made revisions to eighteen documents mentioned in his book, including newspaper articles, a letter from Smith's sister and Hickock's police record. De Bellis comments: "When a breach of trust is created with the reader over such confirmable matters, his doubts begin to gather about other matters of plot, characterization, symbolism, and theme of *In Cold Blood*" (529). Some quotations of several people in *In Cold Blood* change between magazine and book, notably Smith with 187 changes (521). Many of these are relatively minor but given they are quotations that already had been printed as such in *The New Yorker*, they are worrying. De Bellis says his overwhelming impression is that Capote "could not resist re-examining his research and his style" (520) and after comparing his findings with the evidence unearthed by Tompkins, already discussed in chapters one and five, De Bellis concludes that a "strain developed between Capote's intellectual strategy and the emotional reality he faced" (530).

This strain is evident in how Capote depicted Smith, as discussed in the previous chapter, and it is evident, too, in a closer reading of the interviews Capote gave to publicise *In Cold Blood*. This reveals a tension between the second and third threads of his epitextual narrative. When Capote talks about what he endured to create the book he includes the emotional strain of becoming close to the two convicted murderers, especially Smith, of corresponding with them over five years and watching as they deteriorated on death row. When Capote talks about creating a new art form, though, he reduces the two men to subjects in an experiment he is conducting. He told Haskell Frankel of *The Saturday Review* in January 1966 that he became "very very good friends" and "very very close intimates" of Smith and Hickock and that if at the outset he had known what the book would cost him emotionally he would never have started it ("The Author" 71-72). He told Gloria

Steinem, writing for *Glamour* magazine, in April 1966, that Smith had bequeathed his belongings to him and that when they arrived after the execution he “couldn’t even look at them for a long time.” After reflecting on the inhumanity of the appeals system, Capote says he became so “emotionally involved that it was almost a question of personal survival” and that he was now “weary inside” (“A Visit with Truman Capote” 80-81). But he told Plimpton, writing for *The New York Times Book Review* in January 1966, that when Smith had asked him why he was writing a book, Capote told Smith he was pursuing a “strictly aesthetic theory” about creating a non-fiction book that would be a work of art (“The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel” 56). In a lengthy interview with *Playboy* magazine, in 1968, after *In Cold Blood* had been adapted for film and Capote had made a documentary about capital punishment, he referred to the book as an experiment at least three times.

I’d had several dry runs that didn’t work out. I was searching for a suitable subject and, like a bacteriologist, I kept putting slides under the microscope, scrutinizing them and finally rejecting them as unsuitable. It was like trying to solve a quadratic equation with the X – in this case, the subject matter – missing (Norden 122).

Capote’s friend, Windham, among others, noted that most people portrayed in the book were dead by the time *In Cold Blood* was published. Dewey was alive and presented as a diligent detective of integrity. There is no reason to think otherwise of Dewey but Capote became a close friend of the detective, his wife and their son; he addressed them as “dearhearts” in his letters (*Too Brief a Treat* 280, 326), he referred to *In Cold Blood* as “our book” (361) and he spent considerable time reading and commenting on Alvin Junior’s literary compositions (398, 400-03). One unintended victim of the book was Hickock’s son. His mother had remarried and the boy had not known the identity of his father until he read *In Cold Blood* for a school assignment, which deeply upset him. His mother feared he might commit suicide, according to Rev. James Post, chaplain at the prison where Smith and Hickock had been on death row. Post told Capote’s oral biographer, Plimpton, he had immediately gone to see the boy:

I didn’t minimize the horrible things that he’d done or anything like that. But I said his dad wasn’t the sex fiend that Capote tried to make

him out ... like trying to rape the Clutter girl before he killed her ... it didn't happen. And other things ... lies, just to make it a better story (195).

There is no corroborating evidence for Post's recollection but no reason to disbelieve him either. Just as it is clear from Capote's letters and from biographies of him how much he identified with Smith, it is also clear he had little interest in Hickock, regarding him as a "just a smart-aleck, small-time crook" (Norden "Playboy Interview" 133) with a "check-bouncing mentality" (Norden 129). In a mini-biography of Hickock that Capote compiled in his research notes, there is no mention of Hickock having sex with underage girls (Capote papers, Box 7, Folder 14). But as Capote himself says in a letter to the Deweys, he did not mind "inventing details" (Underline in original *Too Brief a Treat* 326).

Study of the paratextual elements of *In Cold Blood* extends the argument outlined in earlier chapters that Capote's book is seriously flawed as a work of book-length journalism. In the book itself Capote provides readers with even fewer means than Woodward of assessing the veracity of his work; a careful examination of public and private sources of information shows Capote manipulating and lying about his work. It is possible to argue, as Sims has, that Capote was working within the standards of his time and that practices have since improved (Sims *True Stories* 236-40). Nonetheless, the ethical issues Capote faced, and in many cases failed to resolve, in the research, the representation and the terms on which he offered his book to readers, affect the entire process of the book's creation and are more deep-rooted than many critics have suggested. Even Sims, who writes that for decades questions about accuracy have been central to controversies about literary journalism, underplays Capote's shortcomings, saying "*In Cold Blood* carried a model for reporting and writing that held more significance for the New Journalism than did some inaccuracies about the price paid for a horse named Babe" (*True Stories* 242). The money paid for Nancy Clutter's horse was not a crucial error, as I acknowledged in chapter one, but even it was more significant than Sims allows, as Capote used the (mistakenly) low sale price to heighten the sense of tragic loss and waste of a much loved animal in its prime, and used it as an echo of the waste of Nancy's life (*In Cold Blood* 77, 169-70, 223). Other ethical lapses by Capote are significantly more serious than Sims allows. More importantly, perhaps, the interviews with practitioners in *The*

New New Journalism show they value Capote's expansion of the possibilities of book-length journalism (125, 151), and they have learnt that such possibilities demand not less but more attention be paid to accuracy, and not simply to factual accuracy but to accuracy in context. The making of two recent feature films about the ethical dilemmas Capote struggled with in creating his non-fiction novel – *Capote* and *Infamous* – also suggests that audiences, too, are interested in questions not just of factual accuracy but the perils of journalists becoming too close to their sources and then betraying them.

Part of Capote and Woodward's sparse paratextual practice surrounding *In Cold Blood* and *The Final Days* does stem from the period in which they were writing. Capote was writing in *The New Yorker* tradition, which explicitly promoted the identity of the magazine rather than the individual writer; for many years the magazine did not publish bylines but printed the journalist's name at the end of articles and it was not until 1969 that it began publishing a table of contents even though this had been standard practice in magazines for decades (Yagoda, *About Town* 43). Capote's journalistic predecessors – Hersey's *Hiroshima* and Ross's account of John Huston's film adaptation of *The Red Badge of Courage* – also did not use paratextual material such as endnotes but Hersey's article was confined mainly to what his six survivors told him they saw and experienced while Ross's account was grounded in what she herself had witnessed; the bulk of Capote's book was a reconstruction of events that happened before he arrived in Holcomb. For *The Final Days* Woodward was influenced not just by White's use of an omniscient narrative voice but by his restrained approach to providing readers with the means to assess his work's veracity. In a brief author's note for the first of his presidential campaign books White explicitly distinguishes between the work of historians needing to list sources and exact references, and the contemporary political reporter's obligation "to protect the privacy of those who have befriended him with information" (*The Making of the President 1960* ix). The problem inherent in White "befriending" those he writes about has been discussed in chapter five; he is a less than open friend to his readers. White includes some footnotes in the body of his book but they are primarily used to expand a point rather than attribute information (For examples see 136, 169 and 316). Occasionally, he feels obliged to explain something to readers, such as the unwillingness of Nixon, then the Republican

candidate, to be interviewed (299-300). White had certainly observed at first hand much that he writes about but White's promise – and appeal – to readers then was that he took them inside a presidential campaign and conveyed “the mood and the strains, the weariness, elation and uncertainties of the men who sought to lead America in the decade of the sixties” (ix).

A series of scandals over accuracy or deception of readers by journalists such as Stephen Glass at *The New Republic* in 1998 and Jayson Blair at *The New York Times* in 2003, has prompted intense self-scrutiny in the news media industry that has extended to book-length projects (Kovach and Rosenstiel 89-110; Clark “The Line between Fact and Fiction” 164-69; Harrington “The Writer's Choice” 77-89). It has become more common for practitioners to include endnotes, bibliographies, forewords and notes on sourcing to help readers weigh the veracity of their work. Lemann argues endnotes offer practitioners a way of attributing information without interrupting the narrative flow of their book, thereby making their work more transparent and setting out the limits of their knowledge (“What About Endnotes?” 192-93) Of Boynton's nineteen interviewees, fourteen include some or all of these pieces of explanatory material. Of the fourteen, seven use endnotes and seven do not use them but provide a detailed note to the reader on their methods. Five Boynton interviewees – Kramer, Langewiesche, Lewis, Orlean and Trillin – provide neither endnotes nor detailed notes to the reader. Of the Australian practitioners discussed in this thesis, six of the seven include explanatory material, though Garner's is scant, and, for *The First Stone*, misleading. The endnotes range from six and seven pages in Krakauer's *Under the Banner of Heaven* and Conover's *Newjack* respectively to forty-three and fifty-five pages in Wright's *The Looming Tower* and Schlosser's *Fast Food Nation* respectively. In addition, these authors provide bibliographies (eight pages in *Under the Banner of Heaven*, three in *Newjack*, six in *Fast Food Nation* and ten in *The Looming Tower*). Mark Bowden's *Black Hawk Down*, which is praised by Wolfe in the quotation at the head of chapter one, has forty-five pages of notes on his sources and on his method for reconstructing an ill-starred military mission in Mogadishu, Somalia that happened a few years beforehand (505-49). The scope of the endnotes and bibliographies in these works of book-length journalism approaches that found in academic books.

Some practitioners who do not provide endnotes do offer detailed notes to the reader. Practitioners interviewed by Boynton also use elements of the paratext to make explicit their attitude to what can be known about their subject. In the foreword to his book *Coyotes*, Conover draws a contrast between the many authors writing about illegal immigrants who probably would not recognize them if one came up and offered to shine their shoes and how, to gain an insight into their experience, Conover disguised himself as an “illegal alien” and accompanied other Mexicans trying to cross the border into the United States. Despite this level of commitment, Conover is acutely aware “This is not the whole story, but I have tried to make it their story” (xix). Finnegan, in the introduction to his book about poverty in the United States, *Cold New World: Growing Up in a Harder Country*, writes:

The moral authority of the social order that once might have allowed me to pass unambivalent judgments on the lives of poor Americans – an authority packed tight, at the best of times, with unexamined assumptions about power and virtue – has, in my view, simply grown too weak to support such exertions. A white, middle-class reporter inspecting the souls of poor African Americans is, given our history, an especially dubious proposition. So I’ve tried to keep one eye on my limitations as observer and analyst, and to reflect, where possible, the densely freighted power relations between me and some of my subjects (xvi).

If it is difficult to imagine Woodward or Capote expressing such sentiments, even practitioners who present their works without drawing attention to their presence in the narrative are demonstrating a growing sophistication in dealing with ethical issues arising in establishing a relationship with readers. Dina Temple-Raston, like Berendt, writes about a murder case in the American south, and like him she arrived there after a murder but unlike him she did not place herself as an overt authorial figure in the book witnessing events that she had not seen. In a note on sources, though, she recounts how the father of one of the three white men accused of chaining a young African American man, James Byrd, to the bumper of a truck and dragging him to his death would not be interviewed but did agree to deliver to her a statement from his son. When they met in a parking lot, he unexpectedly burst into tears, crying “in such volume that his shirt was soaked.” He spoke to her for forty-

five minutes, never taking his foot off the brake and never taking his car out of drive. “He finally drove away, and I realized at that moment that the story of Jasper [in Texas] had yet to be told” (*A Death in Texas* 278-79).

More works of book-length journalism about national security and intelligence agencies are embracing a rigorous approach to sourcing and a transparency with readers. Seymour Hersh is a veteran investigative journalist who has written eight works of book-length journalism and built his reputation mainly on disclosures about national security and intelligence agencies. In an introduction to *Chain of Command: The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*, David Remnick, Hersh’s current editor at *The New Yorker*, writes about how readers are, understandably, frustrated by the use of unnamed sources, especially as some reporters conceal names because it is easier or because it “gives the piece the shadowy sense of a big-time investigation” (xv).

Anonymous sources are necessary in the areas Hersh writes about because they are risking their jobs or prosecution, but Remnick wants to reassure readers that whenever Hersh mentions anonymous sources in his copy, he has been asked by his editors who they are, what their motivations might be and if they can be corroborated. On the surface, it may seem a fine distinction to Woodward’s practice, but where Woodward appears to be granting anonymity to senior officials in any given administration, Hersh is protecting people within intelligence agencies and the military who are providing information about corrupt, sometimes illegal activities in their own organizations. He often has acquired, or been leaked, documentary evidence to support the allegations, such as the photographs of torture of prisoners held at Abu Ghraib outside Baghdad and the internal report by Major General Antonio Taguba which described in detail the beatings and sexual humiliation by Americans of prisoners in the gaol (*Chain of Command* 22). Between the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001 and the Abu Ghraib disclosures in mid-2004, Hersh wrote twenty-six articles for *The New Yorker* ranging from the intelligence failures leading up to the September 11 attacks, to the Bush administration’s efforts to promulgate dubious intelligence on an Iraqi nuclear program, among others (*Chain of Command* xiv-xv). In 2003 when Hersh wrote that the chairman of President Bush’s Defense Policy Board, Richard Perle, also had business interests that stood to profit from a war in Iraq, Perle appeared on CNN and told Wolf Blitzer: “Look, Sy Hersh is the closest thing American journalism has to a terrorist, frankly.” He

threatened to sue Hersh and the magazine but never did (xvii). What is clear from Remnick's introduction is that he and Hersh take seriously both the need to protect anonymous sources and the need to be as open as possible with readers. Their careful and ethical decision-making helps them in their goal of making important disclosures in the national interest.

Where Hersh's work during this particularly testing period in American history epitomizes the maxim usually attributed to Lord Northcliffe "News is what someone, somewhere wants to suppress. All the rest is advertising" (Randall <http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~randall/uj/journoquotes3.html>), Wright's account of the rise of Al-Qaeda manages to investigate an extremely difficult topic and to provide ample explanation of his methods and sources to readers. Wright lists by name more than five hundred and fifty people he interviewed for *The Looming Tower* (439-45), which won the Pulitzer Prize for general non-fiction in 2007. In a Note on Sources, he addresses directly the problem of writing about intelligence operatives and jihadis. He notes the shoddiness of much early scholarship about Al-Qaeda and the unreliability of sworn testimony of witnesses who have proven themselves to be "crooks, liars and double-agents" (447). Some important documents on Al-Qaeda have been seized by various arms of the United States government and used in court cases but even these can be misleading, he writes, and cites several examples. He also offers an example of a "tantalizing" piece of evidence that showed a high-ranking Saudi intelligence officer providing to the CIA in 1999 the names of two of the eventual hijackers of the planes flown into the World Trade Center on September 11 2001 but Wright did not include it because he could not verify it to his satisfaction. He conducted his research "horizontally" and "vertically;" that is, by continually checking hundreds of sources against each other, and by interviewing people in depth, perhaps dozens of times. By outlining his methods he hopes "the reader can begin to appreciate the murky nature of the world in which al-Qaeda operated and the imperfect means I have sometimes employed in order to gain information" (448). Wright dislikes seeing anonymous sources used in books and "so I've dragged as many of my informants into the light as possible." Some sources habitually ask for an interview to be off the record but Wright has found they may later approve specific quotations that he checks back with them. He concludes: "Where there remain items that are not tied to specific individuals or documents,

they represent vital information that I have good reason to accept as true” (449). The level of care and attention Wright pays to verifying delicate and highly sensitive material and his openness with his sources, as shown in his comments quoted at the head of this chapter, are a shining example of a practitioner both enacting the virtue of truthfulness and carefully thinking his way through the complexities and competing demands of his role.

If there is a trend among practitioners towards more extensive use of paratextual material, it needs to be noted that it is not yet universal, as the avoidance of such practices in five Boynton interviewees shows. As to whether readers actually read the extensive notes directed at them, there is little firm evidence, but even if the majority of them pass readers by, that is not a good reason for an ethical practitioner to exclude them. There is a disconnection, though, between the poor reputation journalists have with many in their audiences and the depth of care and attention paid by many practitioners to ethical issues, both in book-length journalism, as exemplified in the work of some practitioners discussed in this thesis, and, according to Craig, in newspaper journalists whose work he studied such as Sonia Nazario (*The Ethics of the Story* 191-94; 10-11). She is a journalist with *The Los Angeles Times* who wrote a multi-part series about a fourteen year old Honduran boy’s illegal journey into the United States to find his mother who had left him at home with her family when he was five years old (“Dealing with Danger” 178-82). Nazario spent six months and filled more than one hundred notebooks researching her topic and produced a powerfully written series for the newspaper in 2002 that included seven thousand words of endnotes and won a Pulitzer prize (“Transforming One Hundred Notebooks into Thirty-five Thousand Words” 208-12; *Telling True Stories* 306). She then expanded the series into a book that was published in 2006. Nazario has recounted the work undergirding her series at the Nieman Foundation conference on Narrative Journalism. She says that she received at least one thousand phone calls and emails from readers about the series (“Dealing with Danger” 181). The newspaper’s reader’s representative, Jamie Gold, said reaction was overwhelmingly positive even though it was about the controversial topic of illegal immigration. “A lot of people did comment on the extensive footnotes, which is really unusual. But they appreciated that. And it might be as a result of that, that I didn’t get a lot of questions about its veracity” (Craig *The Ethics of the Story* 67). This is worth

underscoring because for much of the series Nazario had to reconstruct Enrique's journey. Nazario had been worried the endnotes would make the newspaper seem defensive:

As it turned out, readers appreciated the transparency of the endnotes. They liked seeing the sources of all the information in the series. Surprisingly, they used them to follow the reporting process. They read the endnotes to figure out what I had done – how I had ridden the trains in Mexico and who I had interviewed. I never would have guessed that people would read endnotes for that purpose (“What About Endnotes?” 192)

If endnotes are becoming common in book-length journalism, they are still rare in newspapers. It is possible that new online technologies enabling readers to check sources of information and interact with media outlets is encouraging what appears to be a change in attitude to traditionally hidden practices, but further consideration is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Principal sources of works of book-length journalism are a particular kind of reader. They are as well placed as any to pick up inaccuracies but they may also be so close as to lose perspective on how events and people are portrayed. Principal sources' responses to book-length journalism, then, should be interpreted cautiously. Occasionally, though, their responses can illuminate the ethical issues underlying the relationship between practitioner and principal source. For instance, Salamon was granted extraordinary access to the set of Brian De Palma's film adaptation of Wolfe's bestselling novel, *The Bonfire of the Vanities* that was published in 1987. She extended Ross's *Picture* by writing a comprehensive book entitled *The Devil's Candy* that laid bare the process of how a major Hollywood studio film is made. Unfortunately for De Palma the film was a colossal flop, artistically and commercially.

But a decade after the book's publication in 1992, De Palma agreed to meet Salamon and be interviewed again for a re-issuing of the book. She asked him if he regretted giving her unfettered access with no power of veto over the book. He replied: “It's a book that even at 10 years distance is not particularly easy for me to read...I think

it's very honest" ("Afterword: 10 years later" 421). Asked if he found the book upsetting to read, De Palma said: "What can you say about something that was considered the greatest catastrophe of the day and then have a book written about it afterwards?" So much of what is written about Hollywood is so false, though, he said, that he wanted someone to write something truthful. "I don't think it changed anything, though it made people very aware of the real world we work in. It got a lot of people very angry," he said, probably referring to one of the film's stars, Bruce Willis, who told *Entertainment Weekly* in 1995 that he hoped that one night Salamon would finally understand "the sick life she was living" and "just put a gun in her mouth and blew her fucking brains out" ("Afterword" 427). These responses are illuminating: Willis is revealed as an egotistical bully, De Palma is shown to have a stronger commitment to honesty in filmmaking than might have been expected from the director of such films as *Dressed to Kill* and Salamon is seen as an ethical practitioner striving to balance her twin obligations to her principal sources and her readers.

The nature of the relationship that practitioners aim to create with their readers is the third and final and equally important part of the tripartite framework developed in this thesis. Most practitioners want readers to engage in a rich reading experience, whether they are moved to tears or laughter or outrage by the book's contents. Writing in a narrative mode is the way practitioners can achieve this, which means that the relationship practitioners create with readers can be as close as that created between novelists and their readers. The difference is that the relationship between readers and practitioners of book-length journalism is predicated on an understanding that what is being offered is a representation of actual people, events and issues. This understanding is not a formal contract but is grounded in trust. Such trust is not naïve but is informed by practitioners providing ways and means for readers to weigh the veracity of the truth-telling claims in the work of book-length journalism. These may be through the narrative voice in the body of the work or in the paratext through a range of explanatory devices. The problems Woodward and Capote created for themselves in the writing phase of their works were aggravated by the scant means they gave readers to assess their book's truth-telling claims. Later, many leading practitioners are mindful of their obligations to readers, especially when, pursuing Gardner's fiction dream state, they aim to enthral readers "heart and soul."

Identifying the field of writing discussed here as part of journalism practice has the effect of picking out the particular elements of book-length journalism, which previously existed in a kind of no-man's land. It has been seen as not quite part of the daily news media industries nor of the non-fiction book publishing industry, yet clearly it has a foot in both fields. Despite the absence of comprehensive data about the number of works of book-length journalism published each year in the United States and Australia, the material gathered for this thesis shows that a significant minority of journalists and other practitioners write book-length journalism and it appears the practice is growing. The purpose of identifying and examining this area of writing has not been to set up a new genre; rather, my purpose has been to examine what happens when practitioners use journalistic methods to research and write independently about contemporary people, events, and issues at book-length in a timely manner for a general readership.

What happens is that a number of important ethical issues arise for practitioners throughout the process of researching and writing and publishing a work of book-length journalism. Some of these issues are similar to those experienced by practitioners in daily print journalism while others take a particular form in book-length journalism. By analysing these issues through a tripartite framework that separates the process into phases for research, writing and reception, I have identified the most distinctive and pressing ethical issues. These are: the difficulty faced by practitioners in developing close relationships with principal sources and maintaining a sense of editorial independence, representing actual people, events and issues in a narrative mode, and developing a relationship of informed trust with readers. The first key conclusion of this inquiry is that the practice of journalism at book-length creates an interlocking concentration of ethical issues. Practitioners in newspapers and magazines sometimes develop close relationships with key sources but they generally do not need to glean much personal, intimate information about these sources, and where they do the journalists generally do not need to write about these sources in a narrative mode. Practitioners in newspapers and magazines do sometimes write in a narrative mode but not as often as they write hard news reports.

When they write in a narrative mode their articles usually do not extend beyond a few thousand words, and their work sits in a newspaper or magazine amid a range of other articles, photographs, graphics, comics, listings and advertisements.

Practitioners of book-length journalism need to negotiate and manage difficult and dynamic relationships with principal sources that can seem more than professional but less than personal. The majority of them choose to represent what they find in their research in a narrative mode; here they need to balance the demands of veracity inherent in a form making truth-telling claims with the desirability of creating a narrative that engages readers emotionally as well as intellectually. Practitioners can be tempted to smooth over the gaps and knots of confusion inherent in a serious investigation of the world and create the illusion of a seamless narrative.

Practitioners present their work in books, a form which many readers associate with novels, especially when they are presented with a book that reads like a novel and offers little guidance that it is not a novel but a work of book-length journalism.

Many scholars make literary merit their criteria when choosing which works in this area of writing to study, which means Capote's *In Cold Blood* is included in most discussions of what is variously termed literary journalism, literary non-fiction and creative non-fiction but that Woodward's many works are not. It is a second key conclusion of this thesis, however, that it is the taking of a narrative approach to representing people, events and issues that triggers certain ethical issues, not whether the practitioner is a fine writer like Capote or a plodding one like Woodward.

Gardner's fiction dream state is not predicated on rare literary gifts but on baseline literary skills. That is, it can be induced in romance novels and detective fiction as well as in novels conventionally seen as art, such as George Eliot's *Middlemarch*. Differing readers have differing reading levels; where one might be enthralled by a romance novel but be unprepared for the rigors of reading *Middlemarch*, another may be able, and willing, to engage with both books. Ethically, though, the practitioner of book-length journalism has an obligation to all their readers, regardless of differing reading levels. Ethical issues arise in the practice of book-length journalism written by practitioners of varying levels of literary skill, as underlined by the serious flaws found in both *The Final Days* and *In Cold Blood* throughout the three stages of research, writing and publication.

Whatever their shortcomings, Capote and Woodward remain important figures in the historical development of book-length journalism. For, a third key conclusion of this thesis is that leading practitioners in Australia and especially the United States, through a continuing commitment to reflect on their practice and to act on their reflections, have made substantial advances in resolving ethical issues that arose in the work of Capote, Woodward and other New Journalists. Individually, and on a project-by-project basis, they have established practices for allowing principal sources to give what can be considered in this area of writing practice as informed consent for their involvement in books, and for finding and making clear the boundaries of their close working relationships. They have applied what Aristotle called practical wisdom to clarify in their own minds the porous and shifting line between the worlds of fiction and non-fiction, which equips them, as Marr says, “to deal with the raggedness of events without fictionalizing them, and still maintain the book’s drama” (Personal interview). In so doing, many leading practitioners realize that some approaches to narrative writing, such as interior monologues, may be closed to them. Flowing from their understanding of the importance of distinguishing between fiction and non-fiction, these practitioners take seriously the need to create a relationship with readers of what is termed in this thesis informed trust, providing them with the means by which they can weigh a work’s veracity even as they are drawn by its contents.

In book-length journalism ethical issues arise with less immediate urgency than in daily journalism, and they take a subtler form, but they are no less important for that. For that, too, a virtue ethics approach is well suited. Practitioners have steadily applied practical wisdom to resolving the ethical issues encountered in their book-length projects that I have mined, analysed and set within the tripartite framework developed for this thesis. Their reflections and my analysis suggest both that the SPJ’s and the MEAA’s codes of ethics need expansion to encompass the particular ethical issues arising in book-length journalism, and that, extending Quinn’s argument that external codes be complemented by “an internalized moral psychology for journalists based on virtue” (“Moral Virtues for Journalists” 168), that these issues merit promotion and discussion through, for example, the MEAA’s regular industry forums and its publication, *The Walkley* magazine, and in the United States,

through the Poynter Institute and the Nieman Foundation's professional development programs.

Sitting on a continuum between newspaper and magazine journalism at one end and specialist academic study at the other, book-length journalism is an area of writing that fulfils a valuable social role. A successful work of book-length journalism retains the urgency and sense of connectedness with the interests of a general audience that characterizes daily journalism but has – or makes – the time and space to move beyond the superficial coverage inherent in the daily news media.

Successful works approach the rigor of academic study but are written in a narrative mode with the aim of engaging readers' both emotionally and intellectually. The creation of a body of deeply researched, vividly written books that provide fresh information and explore events in their complexity and people in their full humanity offers at least one part of a solution to problems that have been besetting the news media industries for many years. The purpose of this thesis has been to provide evidence of the nature, range and achievements of book-length journalism, to articulate and to sift and sort my way through the complex ethical issues inherent in its practice and to chart leading practitioners' solutions to these problems – all of which is for the eventual benefit of readers, and by extension, society as a whole.

LIST OF WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED

PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Practitioners' papers:

The New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division. Truman Capote Papers, ca 1924-1984. Boxes 7, 8, 11 and 23.

B. Interviews:

John Bryson. Personal interview, 2 July 2007. Follow-up interviews, 12 March 2008 and 28 May 2008.

Gerald Clarke. Email interview, 23 May 2006.

Mary Cotter. Email interviews, 4 February 2008 and 23 March 2009.

Helen Garner. Personal interview, 29 January 2007. Follow-up interview, 20 February 2008.

Sandy Grant. Telephone interview, 22 January 2008.

Chloe Hooper. Personal interview. 16 March 2009.

Malcolm Knox. Personal interview, 3 July 2007. Follow-up interview, 20 February 2008.

David Marr. Personal interview, 28 February 2007. Follow-up interview, 17 March 2008.

Caitlin Murray. Email inquiry, 17 April 2008.

Margaret Simons. Personal interview, 29 November 2006 and 19 March 2007. Follow-up interview, 20 February 2008.

Michael Webster. Personal interview, 21 January 2008.

C. Book-length journalism:

Agee, James and Walker Evans. *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men*. 1941. London: Panther, 1969.

Barry, Paul. *The Rise and Rise of Kerry Packer*. Sydney: Bantam, 1993.

Berendt, John. *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*. 1994. New York: Vintage, 1996. "Preface to this edition." vii-viii. Dust jacket from first edition. Retrieved on 26 May 2009. <http://www.amazon.com/Midnight-Garden-Good-Evil-Berendt/dp/0679429220/ref=sr_1_1/182-4595968-3505607?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1243318112&sr=1-1#reader>.

Bernstein, Carl and Bob Woodward. *All the President's Men*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1974.

Blackburn, Estelle. *Broken Lives*. Claremont: Stellar, 1998.

- Bowden, Mark. *Black Hawk Down*. 1999. London: Corgi, 2000.
- Brien, Steve. *Azaria: The Trial of the Century*. Victoria: QB Books, 1984.
- Brooks, Geraldine. *Nine Parts of Desire: The Hidden World of Islamic Women*. 1994. Sydney: Anchor, 2003.
- Bryson, John. *Evil Angels*. Melbourne: Viking, 1985.
- _____. "Afterword." *Evil Angels*. New York: Bantam, 1988. 525-36.
- Buford, Bill. *Among the Thugs*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1991.
- Burrough, Bryan and John Helyar. *Barbarians at the Gate: The Fall of RJR Nabisco*. London: Arrow Books, 1990.
- Capote, Truman. "Annals of Crime: In Cold Blood." *The New Yorker*. 25 September, 2 October, 9 October and 16 October 1965: 57-166, 57-175, 58-183 and 62-193.
- _____. *In Cold Blood: A True Account of a Multiple Murder and Its Consequences*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966. Dust-jacket of the first edition published in New York by Random House. Retrieved on 4 June 2009. <http://www.amazon.com/s/ref=nb_ss_b?url=search-alias%3Dstripbooks&field-keywords=in+cold+blood+first+edition&x=12&y=19>.
- Carlin, John. *Playing the Enemy: Nelson Mandela and the Game That Made a Nation*. London: Atlantic Books, 2008.
- Cassidy, John. *Dot.Con: The Greatest Story Ever Sold*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002.
- Chadwick, Paul. *Media Mates: Carving Up Australia's Media*. South Melbourne: Macmillan, 1989.
- Chenoweth, Neil. *Virtual Murdoch: Reality Wars on the Information Highway*. London: Secker & Warburg, 2001.
- Chippindale, Peter and Chris Horrie. *Stick It Up Your Punter! The Uncut Story of "The Sun" Newspaper*. 2nd ed. London: Pocket Books, 1999.
- Connolly, Bob. *Making "Black Harvest": Warfare, Filmmaking and Living Dangerously in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea*. Sydney: ABC Books, 2005.
- Conover, Ted. *Coyotes: A Journey through the Secret World of America's Illegal Aliens*. New York: Vintage, 1987
- _____. *Newjack: Guarding Sing Sing*. 2000. New York, Vintage, 2001.
- Cramer, Richard. *What It Takes: The Way to the White House*. 1992. New York: Vintage, 1993.
- _____. *Joe DiMaggio: The Hero's Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Crick, Michael. *Jeffrey Archer: Stranger Than Fiction*. 1995. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1996.
- Crouse, Timothy. *The Boys on the Bus*. 1973. New York: Ballantine, 1993.
- Danner, Mark. *The Massacre at El Mozote*. 1993. London: Granta Books, 2005.

- Didion, Joan. *Slouching Towards Bethlehem*. 1968. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1974.
- _____. *Salvador*. New York: Vintage-Random, 1983.
- Dover, Bruce. *Rupert's Adventures in China: How Murdoch Lost a Fortune and Gained a Wife*. Camberwell, Victoria: Viking, 2008.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Metropolitan-Holt, 2001.
- _____. *Bait and Switch: The (Futile) Pursuit of the American Dream*. New York: Metropolitan-Holt, 2005.
- Finkel, Michael. *True Story: Murder, Memoir, Mea Culpa*. London: Chatto & Windus, 2005.
- Finnegan, William. *Cold New World: Growing Up in a Harder Country*. 1998. London: Macmillan, 1999.
- Flanagan, Bill. *U2 at the End of the World*. London: Bantam, 1995.
- Follett, Ken. "Preface." *On Wings of Eagles*. 1983. London: Macmillan, 1998. xi-xii.
- Funder, Anna. *Stasiland*. Melbourne: Text, 2002.
- Garner, Helen. *The First Stone*. Sydney: Pan Macmillan, 1995.
- _____. *Joe Cinque's Consolation*. Sydney: Pan Macmillan, 2004.
- Gawenda, Michael. *American Notebook: A Personal and Political Journey*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne UP, 2007.
- Gladwell, Malcolm. *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. New York: Little Brown, 2000.
- Gordon, Harry. *The Time of Our Lives: Inside the Sydney Olympics*. St. Lucia: U of Queensland P, 2003.
- Gourevitch, Philip. *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with Our Families: Stories from Rwanda*. New York: Farrar, 1998.
- _____. *A Cold Case*. New York: Farrar, 2001.
- Gourevitch, Philip and Errol Morris. *Standard Operating Procedure*. New York: Penguin Press, 2008.
- Guttenplan, D.D. *The Holocaust on Trial: History, Justice and the David Irving Libel Case*. London: Granta Books, 2001.
- Haigh, Gideon. *The Cricket War: The Inside Story of Kerry Packer's World Series Cricket*. Melbourne: Text, 1993.
- _____. *The Racket: How Abortion Became Legal in Australia*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne UP, 2008.
- Halberstam, David. *The Powers that Be*. New York: Knopf, 1979.
- Herr, Michael. *Dispatches*. 1979. London: Picador-Pan, 1981.
- Hersey, John. "A Reporter at Large: Hiroshima." *The New Yorker*. 31 August 1946: 15-68.
- _____. *Hiroshima*. 1946. London: Penguin, 1985.

- Hersh, Seymour. *My Lai 4: A Report on the Massacre and Its Aftermath*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- _____. *Chain of Command: The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*. Camberwell, Victoria: Allen Lane, 2004.
- Hill, Barry. *Sitting In*. Port Melbourne: Heinemann, 1991.
- Hooper, Chloe. *The Tall Man: Death and Life on Palm Island*. Camberwell, Victoria: Hamish Hamilton, 2008.
- Junger, Sebastian. *The Perfect Storm: A True Story of Men against the Sea*. 1997. London: Fourth Estate, 2000.
- Jordan, Jennifer. *Savage Summit: The True Stories of the First Five Women Who Climbed K2, the World's Most Feared Mountain*. New York: William Morrow, 2005.
- Kapuscinski, Ryszard. *Imperium*. 1993. Trans. Klara Glowczewska. London: Granta Books, 1994.
- Kelley, Kitty. *His Way: The Unauthorized Biography of Frank Sinatra*. 1986. New York: Bantam, 1987.
- Keneally, Thomas. *Schindler's Ark*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1982.
- Kidder, Tracy. *Among Schoolchildren*. 1989. London: Picador, 1990.
- Kissane, Karen. *Silent Death: the Killing of Julie Ramage*. Sydney: Hodder, 2006.
- Knox, Malcolm. *Secrets of the Jury Room*. Sydney: Random House, 2005.
- Kotlowitz, Alex. *There Are No Children Here: The Story of Two Boys Growing Up in the Other America*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Krakauer, Jon. *Into Thin Air: A Personal Account of the Mount Everest Disaster*. 1997. London: Macmillan, 1998.
- Kram, Mark. *Ghosts of Manila: The Fateful Blood Feud between Muhammad Ali and Joe Frazier*. New York: HarperCollins, 2001.
- Lahr, John. *Dame Edna Everage and the Rise of Western Civilisation*. London: Bloomsbury, 1991.
- Langewiesche, William. *American Ground: Unbuilding the World Trade Center*. 2002. London: Scribner, 2003.
- LeBlanc, Adrian Nicole. *Random Family: Love, Drugs, Trouble, and Coming of Age in the Bronx*. 2003. New York: HarperPerennial, 2004.
- Lemann, Nicholas. *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*. New York: Knopf, 1991.
- _____. *The Big Test: The Secret History of American Meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, 1999.
- Lewis, Michael. *Moneyball: The Art of Winning an Unfair Game*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.
- _____. *The Blind Side: Evolution of a Game*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.
- Linnell, Garry. *Playing God: The Rise and Fall of Gary Ablett*. Sydney: HarperCollins, 2003.

- Lukas, J. Anthony. *Nightmare: The Underside of the Nixon Years*. New York: Viking, 1976.
- Lyall, Kimina. *Out of the Blue: Facing the Tsunami*. Sydney: ABC Books, 2006.
- McGinniss, Joe. *Fatal Vision*. 1983. New York: New American Library, 1989. "The 1985 Afterword," 654-59; "The 1989 Epilogue," 660-84.
- McPhee, John. *Oranges*. 1967. New York: Noonday Press, 1991.
- _____ *The Pine Barrens*. 1968. New York: Noonday Press, 1988.
- _____ 3rd ed. *A Sense of Where You Are: A Profile of Bill Bradley at Princeton*. New York: Farrar, 1999.
- Mailer, Norman. *The Armies of the Night: History as a Novel, the Novel as History*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.
- _____ *The Fight*. 1975. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1991.
- _____ *The Executioner's Song*. 1979. London: Arrow, 1983.
- Malcolm, Janet. *Psychoanalysis: The Impossible Profession*. New York: Knopf, 1981.
- _____ "Annals of Scholarship: Trouble in the Archives." *The New Yorker*. 5 and 12 December 1983: 59-152 and 60-119.
- _____ *In the Freud Archives*. 1984. London: Papermac, 1997. "Afterword." 166-70.
- _____ "Reflections: The Journalist and the Murderer." *The New Yorker*. 13 and 20 March 1989: 38-73 and 49-82.
- _____ *The Journalist and the Murderer*. London: Bloomsbury, 1990. "Afterword." 147-63.
- _____ *The Silent Woman: Sylvia Plath and Ted Hughes*. 1993. London: Picador, 1994. "Note to the British Edition." 209-13.
- _____ *The Crime of Sheila McGough*. New York: Knopf, 1999.
- Marquez, Gabriel Garcia. *News of a Kidnapping*. 1996. Trans. Edith Grossman. New York: Knopf, 1997.
- Marr, David and Marian Wilkinson. *Dark Victory*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2003.
- Masters, Chris. *Jonestown: The Power and the Myth of Alan Jones*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2006.
- Mayer, Jane. *The Dark Side: The Inside Story of How the War on Terror Turned into a War on American Ideals*. New York: Doubleday, 2008.
- Morrison, George. *An Australian in China: Being the Narrative of a Quiet Journey across China to Burma*. London: Horace Cox, 1895.
- Orwell, George. *Down and Out in Paris and London*. 1933. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1974.
- _____ *Homage to Catalonia*. 1938. London: Penguin, 2003.

- _____. *Orwell's England: "The Road to Wigan Pier" in the Context of Essays, Reviews, Letters and Poems selected from "The Complete Works of George Orwell."* Ed. Peter Davison. London: Penguin, 2001
- Plimpton, George. *Shadow Box*. 1977. London: Simon & Schuster, 1989.
- Powers, John. *The Coach: A Season with Ron Barassi*. 1978. Docklands, Victoria: GSPbooks, 2005.
- Preston, Richard. *The Hot Zone*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- _____. *The Demon in the Freezer: The Terrifying Truth about the Threat from Bioterrorism*. New York: Random House, 2002.
- Read, Piers Paul. *Alive: The Story of the Andes Survivors*. 1974. New York: HarperPerennial, 2005. "Introduction," xi-xiv; "A Discussion with Piers Paul Read Three Decades Later," PS section 1-5.
- Remnick, David. *King of the World: Muhammad Ali and the Rise of an American Hero*. New York: Random House, 1998.
- Rich, Frank. *The Greatest Story Ever Sold: The Decline and Fall of Truth – the Real History of the Bush Administration*. New York: Viking, 2006.
- Ricketson, Matthew. *Paul Jennings: 'The Boy in the Story Is Always Me.'* Ringwood: Viking, 2000. "Afterword: Looking for Demons" by Paul Jennings. 294-300.
- Rosenbaum, Ron. *Explaining Hitler: The Search for the Origins of His Evil*. New York: Random House, 1998.
- Ross, Lillian. *Picture*. 1952. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1962.
- Salamon, Julie. *The Devil's Candy: "The Bonfire of the Vanities" Goes to Hollywood*. 1991. Massachusetts: De Capo Press, 2002. "Afterword: 10 years later." 421-32.
- _____. *Facing the Wind: A True Story of Tragedy and Reconciliation*. New York: Random House, 2001
- Schlosser, Eric. *Fast Food Nation: What the All-American Meal Is Doing to the World*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 2001.
- Seabrook, John. *Deeper: A Two-Year Odyssey in Cyberspace*. London: Faber, 1997.
- Sereny, Gitta. *Cries Unheard: The Story of Mary Bell*. 1998. London: Pan Macmillan, 1999. "Introduction to the Paperback," xv-xxii. "Introduction," xxiii-xxviii.
- Shears, Richard. *Azaria*. Melbourne: Thomas Nelson, 1982.
- Silvester, John and Andrew Rule. *Underbelly: The Gangland War*. Smithfield, New South Wales: Sly Ink, 2008.
- Simmonds, James. *Azaria: Wednesday's Child*. West Melbourne: TPNL Books, 1982.
- Simon, David. *Homicide: A Year on the Killing Streets*. 1991. New York: Owl Books, 2006. "Ante Mortem" by Richard Price, xi-xv; "Post Mortem" by David Simon, 623-42; "Case Closed" by Terry McLarney, 643-46.
- Simons, Margaret. *Fit to Print: Inside the Canberra Press Gallery*. Sydney: UNSW Press, 1999.

- _____. *The Meeting of the Waters: The Hindmarsh Island Affair*. Sydney: Hodder, 2003.
- _____. *The Content Makers: Understanding the Media in Australia*. Camberwell, Melbourne: Penguin, 2007.
- Stone, Gerald. *Who Killed Channel 9? The Death of Kerry Packer's Mighty TV Dream Machine*. Sydney: Macmillan, 2007.
- Talese, Gay. *The Kingdom and the Power*. 1969. London: Calder & Boyars, 1971.
- _____. *Honor Thy Father*. London: Souvenir Press, 1971.
- Temple-Raston, Dina. *A Death in Texas: A Story of Race, Murder, and a Small Town's Struggle for Redemption*. New York: Henry Holt, 2002.
- Thompson, Hunter. *Hell's Angels*. 1966. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1967.
- _____. *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas: A Savage Journey to the Heart of the American Dream*. 1971. London: Flamingo, 1993.
- _____. *Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72*. 1973. London: Flamingo, 1994.
- Wallace, Christine. *Greer: Untamed Shrew*. Sydney: Macmillan, 1997.
- White, Theodore. *The Making of the President 1960*. 1961. London: Jonathan Cape, 1964.
- Wilkinson, Marian. *The Fixer: The Untold Story of Graham Richardson*. Port Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1996.
- Williams, Pamela. *The Victory: The Inside Story of the Takeover of Australia*. St Leonards, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin, 1997.
- Wolfe, Tom. *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*. 1968. New York: Bantam, 1981.
- _____. *The Right Stuff*. 1979. London: Picador, 1991.
- Wolff, Michael. *The Man Who Owns the News: Inside the Secret World of Rupert Murdoch*. New York: Knopf, 2008.
- Woodward, Bob and Carl Bernstein. *The Final Days*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- _____. *Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA, 1981-1987*. London: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- _____. *Shadow: Five Presidents and the Legacy of Watergate*. 1999. New York: Touchstone, 2000.
- _____. *Bush at War*. 2002. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003.
- _____. *Plan of Attack*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004.
- _____. *The Secret Man: The Story of Watergate's Deep Throat*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005.
- _____. *State of Denial: Bush at War, Part III*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006.

Wright, Lawrence. *Remembering Satan: A Tragic Case of Recovered Memory*. 1994. New York: Vintage, 1995.

_____. *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda's Road to 9/11*. New York: Penguin, 2006.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abbott, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. 2002. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.

American Anthropological Association Code of Ethics. Retrieved on 6 February 2008. <<http://dev.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm>>.

Amis, Martin. "Truman Capote: Knowing Everybody." *The Moronic Inferno*. London: Penguin, 1986. 32-41.

Anderson, Chris. *Style as Argument: Contemporary American Nonfiction*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

Anderson, Chris. "The Long Tail." Introduction and chapter 7. Retrieved on 26 March 2008. <<http://www.thelongtail.com/about.html>>.

Applegate, Edd, ed. *Literary Journalism: A Biographical Dictionary of Writers and Editors*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Aucoin, James. "Journalistic Moral Engagement: Narrative Strategies in American Muckraking." *Journalism*. 8 (2007): 559-72.

Auden, W.H. "Reading." *The Dyer's Hand, and other Essays*. London: Faber, 1964.

Australian Bookseller and Publisher. "Think Australian 2007. A Guide to the Australian Market Produced by Australian Bookseller and Publisher." Retrieved on 27 March 2008. <<http://www.booksellerandpublisher.com.au/thinkaustalian>>.

Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. London: Oxford UP, 1990.

Bates, Stephen. "Who Is the Journalist's Client?" *Media Ethics*. Fall 1995: 3, 14-16.

Berner, R. Thomas. *Literary Newswriting: The Death of an Oxymoron*. Journalism Monographs 99, October 1986. Columbia, South Carolina: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Bernstein, Matthew. "Documentaphobia and Mixed Modes: Michael Moore's *Roger & Me*." *Documenting the Documentary*. Eds. Barry Grant and Jeannette Sloniowski. Detroit: Wayne State UP. 397-415.

Berry Aileen. "Case That Split a Nation." *The Age*. 23 February 1984: 4.

Berry, Chris. "Exploitation or Exposure: Dennis O'Rourke's *The Good Woman of Bangkok*." *Metro*. Summer 1993: 36-39.

Bird, Delys, Robert Dixon and Christopher Lee, eds. *Authority and Influence: Australian Literary Criticism 1950-2000*. St Lucia, Brisbane: U of Queensland P, 2001.

- Bird, S. Elizabeth. "The Journalist as Ethnographer: How Anthropology Can Enrich Journalistic Practice." *Media Anthropology*. Eds. Eric Rothenbuhler and Mihai Coman. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2005. 301-08.
- Black, Jay, Bob Steele and Ralph Barney. *Doing Ethics in Journalism: A Handbook with Case Studies*. 3rd ed. Florida: Allyn & Bacon. 1997.
- Blackburn, Estelle. *The End of Innocence: The Remarkable True Story of One Woman's Fight for Justice*. Prahran, Melbourne: Hardie Grant, 2007.
- _____. "Finding Narrative Form." Paper for Research, Investigation and Storytelling. Journalism Education Association conference. University of Wollongong, 1 December 2008.
- Blundell, William. *The Art and Craft of Feature Writing*. New York: Plume, 1988.
- Bok, Sissela. *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Bolt, Andrew. "Dark Victory: Credibility Goes Overboard." *The Herald Sun*. 20 March 2003: 19.
- Bookwire: the book industry resource. "US Book Production, 1993-2004, all hardback and paperback." Retrieved on 26 March 2008.
<<http://www.bookwire.com/bookwire/decadebookproduction.html>>.
- Booth, Wayne. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Borden, Sandra. "Empathic Listening: The Interviewer's Betrayal." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 8 (1993): 219-26.
- Boynton, Robert, ed. *The New New Journalism: Conversations with America's Best Nonfiction Writers on Their Craft*. New York: Random, 2005.
- _____. Interview with John Hartsock. "A Good Time for Narrative Journalists: Updating the Old New Journalism." *DoubleTake/Points of Entry* 1.1 (2006): 89-91.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern American Novel*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Brennan, Elizabeth and Elizabeth Clarage. "General nonfiction." *Who's Who of Pulitzer Prize Winners*. Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press, 1999. 252-78.
- Brett, Judith. *Exit Right: The Unravelling of John Howard*. Quarterly Essay 28. Melbourne: Black Inc, 2007.
- "Briefly Noted." Rev. of *The Spare Room*, by Helen Garner. *The New Yorker*. 13 April 2009: 77.
- Brill, Steven. "How Woodward Goes Wayward." *Brill's Content*. September 1999: 29-34.
- Brill, Steven and Bob Woodward. "Rewind." *Brill's Content*. November 1999: 22-23, 122-26.
- Brill, Steven. "Selling Snake Oil." *Brill's Content*. February 2000: 66-69.
- Bromley, David and Lewis Carter, eds. *Toward Reflexive Ethnography: Participating, Observing, Narrating*. Amsterdam: JAI, 2001.

- Burchett, George and Nick Shimmin, eds. *Memoirs of a Rebel Journalist: The Autobiography of Wilfred Burchett*. Sydney: U of NSW P, 2005.
- Campbell, Kate, ed. *Journalism, Literature and Modernity: From Hazlitt to Modernism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000.
- Capote, Truman. "Preface." *Music for Chameleons*. 1980. New York: Signet, 1981. xi-xviii.
- _____. "The Duke in His Domain," a profile of Marlon Brando, and "A Beautiful Child," a profile of Marilyn Monroe. *A Capote Reader*. 1987. London: Penguin, 1993. 517-44, 578-89.
- Capote*. Dir. Bennett Miller. Perf. Philip Seymour Hoffman, Catherine Keeler. United Artists. 2005.
- Carey, James. "The Dark Continent of American Journalism." *Reading the News*. Eds. Robert Manoff and Michael Schudson. New York: Pantheon, 1986. 146-96
- Carey, John, ed. "Introduction." *The Faber Book of Reportage*. London: Faber, 1987. xxix-xxxviii.
- _____. *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia 1880-1939*. London: Faber, 1992.
- Carlyon, Les. *Gallipoli*. Sydney: Macmillan, 2001.
- _____. *The Great War*. Sydney: Pan Macmillan, 2006.
- Carroll, E. Jean. *Hunter: The Strange and Savage Life of Hunter S. Thompson*. New York: Plume, 1993.
- Chadwick, Paul. *Sources and Conflicts: Review of the Adequacy of ABC Editorial Policies Relating to Source Protection and to the Reporting by Journalists of Events in Which They Are Participants*. ABC Director of Editorial Policies. July 2008. Retrieved on 1 May 2009.
<http://www.abc.net.au/corp/pubs/documents/200806_confidentialsources_fi nalreport_july2008.pdf>.
- Chamberlain-Creighton, Lindy. *Through My Eyes: The Autobiography of Lindy Chamberlain-Creighton*. 1990. Bowden, South Australia: East Street Publications, 2004.
- Chance, Jean and William McKeen, eds. "Introduction." *Literary Journalism: A Reader*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 2001. vii-xiv.
- Chancellor, James. "The Family and the Truth?" *Toward Reflexive Ethnography: Participating, Observing, Narrating*. Eds. David Bromley and Lewis Carter. Amsterdam: JAI, 2001. 37-51.
- Cheney, Theodore. *Writing Creative Nonfiction: How to Use Fiction Techniques to Make Your Nonfiction More Interesting, Dramatic - and Vivid*. California: Ten Speed Press, 1991.
- Chernow, Ron. *Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller Sr.* New York: Random House, 1998.
- Christians, Clifford, Mark Fackler and Kim Rotzoll. *Media Ethics: Cases and Moral Reasoning*. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson, 1995.

- Clark, Roy Peter. "The Line between Fact and Fiction." *Telling True Stories: A Nonfiction Writers' Guide from the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University*. Eds. Mark Kramer and Wendy Call. New York: Plume, 2007. 164-69.
- Clarke, Gerald. *Capote: A Biography*. 1988. London: Abacus, 1993.
- _____. ed. *Too Brief a Treat: The Letters of Truman Capote*. New York: Vintage International, 2004.
- Cohen, Elliott and Deni Elliott, eds. *Journalism Ethics: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 1997.
- Coleridge, Samuel. *Biographica Literaria. English Romantic Writers*. Ed. David Perkins. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967. 448-91.
- The Complete New Yorker 1925-2005*. CD-ROM. 8 disks. Introduction by David Remnick. New York: Bondi Digital Publishing, 2005. Updated, 2007.
- Connery, Thomas, ed. *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism: Representative Writers in an Emerging Genre*. New York: Greenwood, 1992.
- Conover, Ted. "Foreword." *True Stories: A Century of Literary Journalism*. Ed. Norman Sims. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2007. ix-xv.
- Cords, Sarah Statz. *The Real Story: A Guide to Nonfiction Reading Interests*. Connecticut: Libraries Unlimited, 2006.
- Cowan, Geoffrey. "The Legal and Ethical Limitations of Factual Misrepresentation." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 560 (1998): 155-64.
- Craig, David. *The Ethics of the Story: Using Narrative Techniques Responsibly in Journalism*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006.
- Cramer, Janet and Michael McDevitt. "Ethnographic Journalism." Ed. Sharon Iorio. *Qualitative Research in Journalism: Taking It to the Streets*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004. 127-43.
- Crick, Bernard. *George Orwell: A Life*. 1982. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1992.
- Curthoys, Ann. "Where Is Feminism Now?" *Bodyjamming: Sexual Harrassment, Feminism and Public Life*. Ed. Jenna Mead. Milsons Point, New South Wales: Random, 1997. 189-212.
- d'Alpuget, Blanche. *On Longing*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne UP, 2008.
- De Bellis, Jack. "Visions and Revisions: Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*." *Journal of Modern Literature*. 7.3 (1979): 519-36.
- Dever, Maryanne. Rev. of *Joe Cinque's Consolation*, by Helen Garner. "Hanging Out for Judgement?" *Hecate's Australian Women's Book Review*. 16.2 (2004). Retrieved on 20 February 2008.
<<http://www.emsah.uq.edu.au/awsr/awbr/issues/138/dever.html>>.
- Didion, Joan. "Political Pornography." *Political Fictions*. 2001. New York: Vintage International, 2002. 191-214. Originally published as "The Deferential Spirit" in *The New York Review of Books*. 19 September 1996.

- Doležel, Lubomír. "Fictional and Historical Narrative: Meeting the Postmodernist Challenge." *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis*. Ed. David Herman. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State UP, 1999. 247-73.
- Dufresne, Marcel. "Why *Midnight* May Be Darker Than You Think." *Columbia Journalism Review*. May/June 1998: 78-79.
- Dunn, Scott. "Rolling Stone's Coverage of the 1972 U.S. Presidential Election." *Asia-Pacific Media Educator* 18 (2007): 31-43.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 1983. 2nd ed. London: Basil Blackwell, 1996.
- Eakin, Paul John. *Touching the World: Reference in Autobiography*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1992.
- Eason, David. "The New Journalism and the Image-World." *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Norman Sims. New York: Oxford UP, 1990. 191-205.
- Ehrlich, Matthew. *Journalism in the Movies*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2006.
- Elliott, Deni and Charles Culver. "Defining and Analyzing Journalistic Deception." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 7 (1992): 69-84.
- Emery, Fred. *Watergate: The Corruption of American Politics and the Fall of Richard Nixon*. New York: Times Books, 1994.
- Epstein, Joseph. "A Lad of the World: Truman Capote and the Cost of Charm." *The Weekly Standard*. 6 December 2004: 21-25.
- Eriksen, Thomas. *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology* 2nd ed. London: Pluto Press, 2001.
- Fakazis, Elizabeth. *Janet Malcolm: Constructing a Journalist's Identity*. Diss. Indiana University, 2002. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2003.
- _____. "How Close Is Too Close? When Journalists Become Their Sources." *Desperately Seeking Ethics: A Guide to Media Conduct*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2003. 45-59.
- Felt, Mark and John O'Connor. *A G-Man's Life: The FBI, Being 'Deep Throat' and the Struggle for Honor in Washington*. New York: Public Affairs, 2006.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. *From Fact to Fiction: Journalism and Imaginative Writing in America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1985.
- Fitzgerald, Ross. Rev. of *Dark Victory*, by David Marr and Marian Wilkinson. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 29 March 2003. Retrieved on 22 April 2009. <<http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2003/03/28/1048653839298.html>>.
- Fletcher, Clare and Jane Barraclough. "And Then There Were Ten..." *The Walkley magazine*. December 2007/January 2008: 34-35.
- Flint, David. "Psychosexual Treatment of Alan Jones Relies on Rumours." *The Australian*. 30 October 2006: 14.
- Fontana, Monica. "Plunging into the Underground: Poverty and Violent Crime in Contemporary Brazil." *Asia-Pacific Media Educator*. 18 (2007): 73-84.

- Frank, Russell. "'You Had to Be There' (and They Weren't): The Problem with Reporter Reconstructions." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 14.3 (1999): 146-58.
- _____. "The Trickster in the Newsroom." *Points of Entry*. 2 (2004): 45-58.
- Frankel, Haskell. "The Author." *Truman Capote: Conversations*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1987. 69-72.
- Franklin, Jon. *Writing for Story: Craft Secrets of Dramatic Nonfiction by a Two-Time Pulitzer Prize Winner*. New York: Plume, 1986.
- Fraser, Morag. Rev. of *Dark Victory*, by David Marr and Marian Wilkinson and *Don't Tell the Prime Minister*, by Patrick Weller. "Dehumanising Us All." *Australian Book Review*. April 2003: 8-9.
- Frayn, Michael. *The Tin Men*. 1965. London: Fontana, 1966.
- Frey, James. "A Note to the Reader." *A Million Little Pieces*. 2003. London: John Murray, 2006. n. pag.
- "Frey, Publisher Settle Suits over 'Pieces.'" Associated Press. 12 September 2006. Retrieved on 6 February 2008. <<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/14715706/>>.
- Friend, Tad. "Notes on the Death of the Celebrity Profile." *Lost in Mongolia: Travels in Hollywood and Other Foreign Lands*. New York: Random House, 2001. 40-48.
- Frus, Phyllis. *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative: The Timely and the Timeless*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Fuller, Jack. "News and Literary Technique." *News Values: Ideas for an Information Age*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996. 131-64.
- Futterman, Dan. "*Capote*": *The Shooting Script*. London: Nick Hern Books, 2006.
- Gare, Shelley and Peter Wilson. "Twist in the Tale of a Sierra Leonean Child Soldier as Dates and Facts Begin to Unravel." *The Weekend Australian*. 19 January 2008: 1, 8, 15, 22-23.
- Garner, Helen. Letter. "Sticks and Stones." *The Age*. 23 September 1995: 22.
- _____. "The Art of the Dumb Question." *True Stories: Selected Non-fiction*. Melbourne: Text, 1996. 1-12.
- Garson, Helen. *Truman Capote*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Genette, Gérard. *Fiction & Diction*. 1991. Trans. Catherine Porter. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.
- _____. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. 1987. Trans. Jane Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Gilmore, Mikal. *Shot in the Heart*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Glass, Ira, ed. "Introduction." *The New Kings of Nonfiction*. New York: Riverhead Press, 2007. 1-14.
- Glover, Stephen, ed. *Secrets of the Press: Journalists on Journalism*. London: Allen Lane, 1999.

- Goldstein, Tom. *Journalism and Truth: Strange Bedfellows*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2007.
- Goldsworthy, Kerryn. *Helen Garner*. Australian Writers series. Melbourne: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Good, Howard. "Jacob A. Riis." *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism: Representative Writers in an Emerging Genre*. Ed. Thomas Connery. New York: Greenwood, 1992. 81-89.
- Gottlieb, Martin. "Dangerous Liaisons: Journalists and Their Sources." *Columbia Journalism Review*. July/August 1989: 21-35.
- Greenberg, David. *Nixon's Shadow: The History of an Image*. New York: Norton, 2003.
- _____. "Beyond Deep Throat." *Columbia Journalism Review*. September/October 2005: 51-53.
- Gutkind, Lee. *The Art of Creative Nonfiction: Writing and Selling the Literature of Reality*. New York: John Wiley, 1997.
- _____. ed. "The Creative Nonfiction Police?" *In Fact: The Best of Creative Nonfiction*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2005. xix-xxxiii.
- _____. Letter. *Harper's*. January 2008: 8-9.
- Haigh, Gideon. "Australian Book-length Journalism." Unpublished paper prepared for the Best Australian Journalism of the 20th Century conference. State Library of Victoria, Melbourne. 26 November 2004.
- Halberstam, David, ed. "Introduction." *The Best American Sports Writing of the Century*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999. xix-xxxiii.
- Harrington, Walt, ed. Prologue: "The Job of Remembering for the Tribe" and "A Writer's Essay: Seeking the Extraordinary in the Ordinary." *Intimate Journalism: The Art and Craft of Reporting Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1997. xi-xlvi.
- _____. "The Writer's Choice." *River Teeth: A Journal of Nonfiction Narrative*. 5.2 (2004): 77-89.
- Hartsock, John. *A History of American Literary Journalism: The Emergence of a Modern Narrative Form*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2000.
- _____. "'Lettre' from Berlin." *Double-Take/Points of Entry*. 2.1 (2007): 106-11.
- Harvard Law School. "Samantha Power '99 to Join National Security Council." 30 January 2009. Retrieved on 14 April 2009.
<<http://www.law.harvard.edu/news/2009/01/30.html>>.
- Havill, Adrian. *Deep Truth: The Lives of Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein*. New York: Birch Lane, 1993.
- Hayes, Arthur. *Press Critics Are the Fifth Estate: Media Watchdogs in America*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2008.
- Heenan, Tom. *From Traveller to Traitor: The Life of Wilfred Burchett*. Melbourne: Melbourne UP, 2006.

- Hellmann, John. *Fables of Fact: The New Journalism as New Fiction*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1981.
- Herman, David, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Herman, David, Manfred Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan, eds. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Hersey, John. "The Legend on the License." *Killing the Messenger: 100 Years of Media Criticism*. Ed. Tom Goldstein. New York: Columbia UP, 1989. 247-67.
- Heyne, Eric. "Toward a Theory of Literary Nonfiction." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 33.3 (1987): 479-91.
- _____. "Where Fiction Meets Nonfiction: Mapping a Rough Terrain." *Narrative*. 9.3 (2001): 322-33.
- Hoffman, Joyce. *Theodore H. White and Journalism as Illusion*. Columbia, Missouri: U of Missouri P, 1995.
- Holroyd, Michael. "Smoke with Fire: On the Ethics of Biography." *Works on Paper: The Craft of Biography and Autobiography*. 2002. London: Abacus, 2003. 10-19.
- Honderich, Ted, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.
- Hope, Deborah. "Loose with the Truth." *The Australian*. 25 January 2008: 13.
- Howarth, William L., ed. "Introduction." *The John McPhee Reader*. New York: Farrar, 1976. vii-xxiii.
- Howe, Adrian, ed. *Lindy Chamberlain Revisited: A 25th Anniversary Retrospective*. Canada Bay, New South Wales: LhR Press, 2005.
- Hulteng, John L. *The Messenger's Motives: Ethical Problems of the News Media*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Hurst, John. *The Walkleys: Australia's Best Journalists in Action*. Richmond, Melbourne: John Kerr, 1988.
- Hurst, John and Sally White. *Ethics and the Australian News Media*. Melbourne: Macmillan, 1994.
- Hursthouse, Rosalind. *On Virtue Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Hutton, Geoffrey and Les Tanner, eds. *125 Years of Age*. West Melbourne: Nelson, 1979.
- Infamous*. Dir. Douglas McGrath. Perf. Toby Jones, Sandra Bullock. Warner Brothers. 2006.
- Inge, M. Thomas. *Truman Capote: Conversations*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1987.
- The Insider*. Dir. Michael Mann. Perf. Al Pacino, Russell Crowe. Touchstone Pictures, 1999.
- International Association for Literary Journalism Studies. Retrieved on 3 March 2009. <<http://www.ialjs.org>>.

- Isaacson, Walter. *Kissinger: A Biography*. 1992. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005.
- Jack, Ian, ed. "Introduction." *The Granta Book of Reportage*. 1993. London: Granta, 1998. v-xiii.
- Jackson, Sally. "Hacks Find Escape between the Covers." *The Australian*. Media. 11 May 2009: 35-36.
- _____. "Prizes That Buy Time for Thinking." *The Australian*. Media. 11 May 2009: 35-36.
- Johnson, Michael. *The New Journalism: The Underground Press, the Artists of Nonfiction and Changes in the Established Media*. Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1971.
- Johnston, Jane. "Turning the Inverted Pyramid Upside Down: How Australian Print Media is Learning to Love the Narrative." *Asia-Pacific Media Educator*. 18 (2007): 1-15.
- Jones, Dan. "John Hersey." *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism: Representative Writers in an Emerging Genre*. Ed. Thomas Connery. New York: Greenwood, 1992. 213-21.
- Joseph, Sue. "Retelling Untellable Stories: Ethics and the Literary Journalist." *Asia-Pacific Media Educator*. 18 (2007): 125-39.
- "Judge Approves *A Million Little Pieces* Refund Settlement for Disgruntled Readers." Associated Press. 2 November 2007. Retrieved on 6 February 2008. <<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,307837,00.html>>.
- Keeble, Richard and Sharon Wheeler, eds. *The Journalistic Imagination: Literary Journalists from Defoe to Capote and Carter*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Kelliher, Laurie. "Ties That Bind." *Columbia Journalism Review*. May/June 2004: 40-43.
- Keneally, Thomas. *Searching for Schindler: A Memoir*. Sydney: Knopf Australia, 2007.
- Kenamer, David. "What Journalists and Researchers Have in Common About Ethics." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 20 (2005): 77-89.
- Kenner, Hugh. "The Politics of the Plain Style." *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Norman Sims. New York: Oxford UP, 1990. 183-90.
- Kerrane, Kevin "Making Facts Dance." *The Art of Fact: A Historical Anthology of Literary Journalism*. Eds. Kevin Kerrane and Ben Yagoda. New York: Scribner, 1997. 17-20.
- Killenbergh, George and Rob Anderson. *Before the Story: Interviewing and Communication Skills for Journalists*. New York: St. Martin's, 1989.
- Kissinger, Henry. *Years of Upheaval*. Boston: Little Brown, 1982.
- Knightley, Phillip. *The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero and Myth-maker from the Crimea to Kosovo*. 1975. London: Prion, 2000.
- Koenig, Brigitte. "Introduction." *The People of the Abyss*. By Jack London. 1903. London: Pluto Press, 2003. v-xi.

- Kornstein, Daniel. "Twisted Vision: Janet Malcolm's Upside Down View of the *Fatal Vision* Case." *Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature*. 1.2 (1989): 127-56.
- Kovach, Bill and Tom Rosenstiel. *The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect*. 2001. 2nd ed. New York: Three Rivers, 2007.
- Kramer, Mark. "Breakable Rules for Literary Journalists." *Literary Journalism. A New Collection of the Best American Nonfiction*. Eds. Norman Sims and Mark Kramer. New York: Ballantine, 1995. 21-34.
- Kramer, Mark and Wendy Call, eds. *Telling True Stories: A Nonfiction Writers' Guide from the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University*. New York: Plume, 2007.
- Kraus, Carolyn. "Journalism, Creative Nonfiction and the Power of Academic Labels." *Points of Entry*. 1 (2003): 25-34.
- Kulick, Don and Margaret Wilson, eds. *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Kunkel, Thomas. *Genius in Disguise: Harold Ross of "The New Yorker"*. New York: Random House, 1995.
- _____. ed. *Letters from the Editor: "The New Yorker's" Harold Ross*. 2000. New York: Modern Library, 2001.
- Lappin, Elena. "The Man with Two Heads." *Granta*. Summer 1999: 7-65.
- Legge, Kate. "Truly Helen." *The Weekend Australian magazine*. 29 March 2008: 16-21.
- _____. "The Secret Life of Blanche." *The Weekend Australian magazine*. 2 August 2008: 10-14.
- Lehman, Daniel W. *Matters of Fact: Reading Nonfiction over the Edge*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1997.
- _____. "Mining a Rough Terrain: Weighing the Implications of Nonfiction." *Narrative* 9.3 (2001): 334-42.
- Lemann, Nicholas. "Weaving Story and Idea" and "What About Endnotes?" *Telling True Stories: A Nonfiction Writers' Guide from the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University*. Eds. Mark Kramer and Wendy Call. New York: Plume, 2007. 112-16, 192-93.
- Lettre Ulyssess Award for the Art of Reportage. Retrieved on 27 March 2009. <<http://www.lettre-ulyssess-award.org/>>.
- Lewin, Leonard. "Is Fact Necessary?" *Columbia Journalism Review*. Winter 1966: 29-34.
- Lieberman, Kenneth. "Ethnographic Practice and the Critical Spirit." *Toward Reflexive Ethnography: Participating, Observing, Narrating*. Eds. David Bromley and Lewis Carter. Amsterdam: JAI, 2001. 93-116.
- Lifton, Robert and Greg Mitchell. *Hiroshima in America: Fifty Years of Denial*. New York: Grosset/Putnam, 1995.

- Lodge, David. "The Non-Fiction novel (Thomas Carlyle)." *The Art of Fiction*. London: Penguin, 1992. 201-05.
- Loh, Sandra Tsing. *Depth Takes a Holiday: Essays from Lesser Los Angeles*. New York: Riverhead Press, 1996.
- Long, Barbara. "In Cold Comfort." *Esquire*. June 1966: 124, 126, 128, 171-73, 175-81.
- Lorenz, Andrea. "When You Weren't There: How Reporters Recreate Scenes for Narrative." *River Teeth: A Journal of Nonfiction Narrative* 7.1 (2005): 71-85.
- Lounsberry, Barbara. *The Art of Fact: Contemporary Artists of Nonfiction*. New York: Greenwood, 1990.
- _____. "Anthology introduction." *Writing Creative Nonfiction: The Literature of Reality*. Eds. Gay Talese and Barbara Lounsberry. New York: HarperCollins, 1996. 29-31.
- Ludtke, Melissa. "The Ties That Bind: Newspapers and Nonfiction Books." *Nieman Reports*. Winter 2008. Retrieved on 3 March 2009.
<<http://www.nieman.harvard.edu/reportsitem.aspx?id=100716>>.
- Lule, Jack. *Daily News, Eternal Stories: The Mythological Role of Journalism*. New York: Guilford Press, 2001.
- McCalman, Iain. "Flirting with Fiction." *The Historian's Conscience: Australian Historians on the Ethics of History*. Ed. Stuart Macintyre. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne UP, 2004. 151-61.
- Macdonald, Kevin and Mark Cousins. *Imagining Reality: The Faber Book of Documentary*. London: Faber, 1996.
- McEvoy, Dermot. "Bestselling Books 2009: Hardcover Old and New." *Publishers Weekly*. 23 March 2009. Retrieved on 14 April 2009.
<<http://www.publishersweekly.com/article/CA6645568.html>>.
- McKay, Jenny. "The Storm as a Model for Contemporary Reporting." Eds. Richard Keeble and Sharon Wheeler. *The Journalistic Imagination: Literary Journalists from Defoe to Capote and Carter*. London: Routledge, 2007. 15-28.
- McKeen, William. *Tom Wolfe*. Twayne's United States Authors Series No. 650. New York: Twayne, 1995.
- _____. *Outlaw Journalist: The Life and Times of Hunter S. Thompson*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2008.
- McKenzie, Robert. "Philosophies for Media Systems" and "News Reporting." *Comparing Media from Around the World*. Boston: Pearson, 2006. 71-87, 249-302.
- McPhee, John. "Checkpoints: Fact-checkers Do it a Tick at a Time." *The New Yorker*. 9 and 16 February 2009: 56-63.
- Manoff, Robert Carl and Michael Schudson, eds. *Reading the News*. New York: Pantheon, 1986.

- Marr, David and Andrew Bolt. Interview with Tony Jones. ABC television. *Lateline*. "Friday Forum." 14 March 2003. Retrieved on 22 April 2009. <<http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2003/s807607.htm>>.
- Marr, David. "Patrick White: The Final Chapter." *The Monthly*. April 2008: 28-42.
- Martyn, Shona. "A Write of Passage." *The Walkley magazine*. December 2007/January 2008: 20.
- Maryles, Daisy. "How They Landed On Top." *Publishers Weekly*. 19 March 2001. Retrieved on 21 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA83542>>.
- _____. "Few Surprises in the Winners' Circle." *Publishers Weekly*. 18 March 2002. Retrieved on 18 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA201791>>.
- _____. "Bestsellers of 2002: The Big Didn't Get Bigger." *Publishers Weekly*. 24 March 2003. Retrieved on 18 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA286525>>.
- _____. "The Stakes Rise for Chart Toppers." *Publishers Weekly*. 22 March 2004. Retrieved on 20 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA405070>>.
- _____. "No Room at the Top." *Publishers Weekly*. 28 March 2005. Retrieved on 14 April 2009. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/article/CA512903.html>>.
- _____. "Truth Is Stronger Than Fiction." *Publishers Weekly*. 27 March 2006. Retrieved on 21 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA63189>>.
- _____. "Bestsellers '06." *Publishers Weekly*. 8 January 2007. Retrieved on 21 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA64046>>.
- _____. "Bestsellers '07." *Publishers Weekly*. 14 January 2008. Retrieved on 21 January 2008. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA65220>>.
- _____. "Bestsellers '08." *Publishers Weekly*. 12 January 2009. Retrieved on 14 April 2009. <<http://www.publishersweekly.com/article/CA6628159.html>>.
- Masters, Chris. *Not for Publication*. Sydney: ABC Books, 2002.
- Mead, Jenna. "A Player in the Ormond Drama Defends her Cause." *The Age*. 16 August 1995: 17.

- _____. ed. *Bodyjamming: Sexual Harrassment, Feminism and Public Life*. Milsons Point, New South Wales: Random, 1997.
- Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance. *Ethics in Journalism: Report of the Ethics Review Committee, Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance, Australian Journalists' Association section*. Melbourne: Melbourne UP, 1997.
- Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance code of ethics. Retrieved on 13 February 2006. <http://www.alliance.org.au/resources/doc_details/code_of_ethics/>.
- Medew, Julia. "Profile: Karen Kissane, senior writer." *Inside: Bi-monthly Publication for Subscribers of "The Age."* April 2006: 1-2.
- Meilaender, Gilbert. *The Theory and Practice of Virtue*. Notre Dame, Indiana: U of Notre Dame P, 1984.
- Mende, Angela. Rev. of *Secrets of the Jury Room*. "Gaining a Healthy Respect for the Jury." *Law Society of New South Wales Journal*. October 2005. Retrieved on 22 April 2009. <<http://www.lawsociety.com.au/page.asp?PartID=17500>>.
- Meray, Tibor. *On Burchett*. Kallista, Victoria: Callistemon Publications, 2008.
- Milner, Andrew. *Literature, Culture and Society*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Mindich, David. *Just the Facts: How "Objectivity" Came to Define American Journalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Mitchell, Joseph. "Author's Note." *Up in the Old Hotel and Other Stories*, Vintage, New York, 1993. ix-xiii.
- Morris, Edmund. "Publisher's note." *Dutch: A Memoir of Ronald Reagan*. 1999. London: HarperCollins, 2000. vii-xvi.
- Muller, Denis. "Media Accountability in a Liberal Democracy: An Examination of the Harlot's Prerogative." Diss. U of Melbourne, 2005.
- Munro, Craig and Robyn Sheahan-Bright. *Paper Empires: A History of the Book in Australia 1946-2005*. St Lucia, Brisbane: U of Queensland P, 2006.
- Murphy, James. *The New Journalism: A Critical Perspective*. Journalism Monographs 34. Lexington, Kentucky: Association for Education in Journalism, 1974.
- Murphy, Sally. Rev. of *Dark Victory*, by David Marr and Marian Wilkinson. "A Chilling Account of the 'Protection' of Australia's Borders." *Aussiereviews.com*. Retrieved on 22 April 2009. <<http://www.aussiereviews.com/article1245.html>>.
- Nance, William. *The Worlds of Truman Capote*. New York: Stein and Day, 1970.
- "Narrative Journalism: Reporting and Writing in a Different Voice." *Nieman Reports*. 54:3. Fall 2000: 4-44.
- Nazario, Sonia. "Dealing with Danger: Protecting Your Subject and Your Story," "What about Endnotes?" and "Transforming One Hundred Notebooks into Thirty-five Thousand Words." *Telling True Stories: A Nonfiction Writers' Guide from the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University*. Eds. Mark Kramer and Wendy Call. New York: Plume, 2007. 178-82, 192, 208-12.
- Neill, Rosemary. "Garner Hype Goes too Far." *The Australian*. 17 August 1995: 11.

- Nell, Victor. *Lost in a Book: The Psychology of Reading for Pleasure*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.
- New York University Journalism Department. "Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century." 1999. Retrieved on 16 February 2006. <<http://www.infoplease.com/ipea/AO777379.html>>.
- Nichols, Bill. "Why Are Ethical Issues Central to Documentary Filmmaking?" *Introduction to Documentary*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana UP, 2001: 1-19.
- Nielsen BookScan. The Top 100 Bestselling Non-fiction Books of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. Provided by Michael Webster, principal consultant for Nielsen BookScan in Australia.
- Newquist, Roy. "Truman Capote." *Truman Capote: Conversations*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1987. 38-46.
- Nixon, Richard. *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. London: Arrow Books, 1978.
- Norden, Eric. "Playboy Interview." *Truman Capote: Conversations*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1987. 110-63.
- Nossek, Hillel and Hanna Adoni. "The Future of Reading as a Cultural Behavior in a Multi-channel Environment." *The Future of the Book in the Digital Age*, Eds. Bill Cope and Angus Phillips. Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2006. 89-113.
- Nuttall, Nick. "Cold-blooded journalism: Truman Capote and the Non-fiction Novel." *The Journalistic Imagination: Literary Journalists from Defoe to Capote and Carter*. Eds. Richard Keeble and Sharon Wheeler. London: Routledge, 2007. 130-44.
- O'Connor, John. "I'm The Guy They Called Deep Throat." *Vanity Fair*. July 2005: 84-87, 127-31.
- Oakley, Justin and Dean Cocking. *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- O'Donnell, Marcus, guest ed. "Special Issue: Narrative and Literary Journalism." *Asia-Pacific Media Educator*. 18 (2007): 1-154.
- Overholser, Geneva and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, eds. *The Press*. Institutions of American Democracy Series. New York: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Page, Wendy. "Murder He Wrote." *Australian Story: Behind the Scenes*. Sydney: ABC Books, 2005. 200-13.
- Pauly, John. "The Politics of the New Journalism." *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Norman Sims. New York: Oxford UP, 1990. 110-29.
- Pearl, Cyril. *Morrison of Peking*. 1967. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.
- Pearson, Christopher. "Detestable standards." *The Weekend Australian*. Inquirer. 28 October 2006: 30.
- Peretz, Evgenia. "James Frey's Morning After." *Vanity Fair*. June 2008. Retrieved on 16 May 2008. <<http://www.vanityfair.com/culture/features/2008/06/frey200806?printable=true¤t>>.

- Plimpton, George. *Truman Capote: In Which Various Friends, Enemies, Acquaintances, and Detractors Recall His Turbulent Career*. 1998. London: Picador, 1999.
- _____. "The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel." *Truman Capote: Conversations*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1987. 47-68.
- Ponce de Leon, Charles L. *Self-Exposure: Human-Interest Journalism and the Emergence of Celebrity in America, 1890-1940*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2002.
- Power, Samantha. "Crossing Over: From Advocacy to Narrative." *Telling True Stories: A Nonfiction Writers' Guide from the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University*. Eds. Mark Kramer and Wendy Call. New York: Plume, 2007. 281-84.
- Powers, William. "Hamlet's Blackberry: Why Paper is Eternal." Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. Discussion paper 39 (2006): 1-74.
- _____. "The Eternal Power of Print." The 11th Readership Conference and Expo. World Association of Newspapers. Hotel Okura, Amsterdam. 16 and 17 October 2008.
- The Prime Minister's Prize for History. Australian Government. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. Retrieved on 14 April 2009.
<http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/key_issues/Australian_History/pm_historyprize.htm>. Project for Excellence in Journalism. *The State of the News Media 2008*. Executive summary. Retrieved on 26 March 2008.
<http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/2008/printable_overview_chapter.htm>. Chapter on magazines. Retrieved on 27 March 2008.
<http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/2008/printable_magazines_chapter.htm>.
- Publishers Weekly*. Interview. "Frey's Agent Goes on the Record with 'PW'." 31 January 2006. Retrieved on 6 February 2008.
<<http://www.publishersweekly.com/article/CA6303378.html?text=evashevski>>.
- Publishers Weekly*. 1960s Bestsellers; 1970s Bestsellers; 1980s Bestsellers; 1990s Bestsellers. Retrieved on 9 May 2006. Cader Books. Bronxville, New York. 2002. <<http://www.caderbooks.com/bestintro.html>>.
- Pulitzer Prize winners for fiction. Retrieved on 15 June 2009.
<<http://www.pulitzer.org/bycat/Fiction>>.
- Pulitzer Prize winners for General nonfiction 1962-2008. Retrieved on 14 April 2009. <<http://www.pulitzer.org/bycat/General+Nonfiction>>. Description of the general nonfiction category. Retrieved on 15 June 2009.
<<http://www.pulitzer.org/citation/2008-General-Nonfiction>>.

- Queensland Premier's Literary Awards. Retrieved on 23 January 2008.
<http://www.premiers.qld.gov.au/awardsevents/awards/Queensland_Premiers_Literary_awards/About_the_Literary_Awards/>.
- Quinn, Aaron. "Moral Virtues for Journalists." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 22. 2 (2007): 168-86.
- Randall, David. The Universal Journalist homepage. Retrieved on 16 June 2009.
<<http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~randall/uj/journoquotes3.html>>.
- Random House. Media release. "Notice to Customers Regarding *A Million Little Pieces* by James Frey." 14 June 2007. Retrieved on 6 February 2008.
<<http://www.randomhouse.biz/media/pdfs/ClassNoticeFin.pdf>>.
- Reed, Kenneth. *Truman Capote*. Twayne's United States Authors Series No. 388. Boston: Twayne, 1981.
- Remnick, David, intr. "Introduction." *The Second John McPhee Reader*. Ed. Patricia Strachan. New York: Farrar, 1996. vii-xvii.
- _____. "Introduction." *Chain of Command: The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*. Camberwell, Victoria: Allen Lane, 2004. ix-xix.
- Rhodes, Richard. *How to Write: Advice and Reflections*. New York: Quill, 1995.
- Richards, Ian. *Quagmires and Quandaries: Exploring Journalism Ethics*. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2005.
- Richter, Robert, QC. Rev. of *Secrets of the Jury Room*. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 October 2005. Retrieved on 22 April 2009.
<<http://www.smh.com.au/news/book-reviews/secrets-of-the-jury-room/2005/10/27/1130382516062.html>>.
- Ricketson, Matthew. "The Demidenko-Darville and Garner Controversies." ABC Radio National. *The Media Report*. 24 August 1995.
- _____. "After Midnight." *The Herald Sun*. Weekend. 4 November 1995: 9.
- _____. "Newspaper Feature Writing in Australia 1956-1996." *Journalism: Print, Politics and Popular Culture*. Eds. Ann Curthoys and Julianne Schultz. St Lucia, Queensland: U of Queensland P, 1999. 168-84.
- _____. "Helen Garner's *The First Stone*: Hitchhiking on the Credibility of Other Writers." *Bodyjamming: Sexual Harassment, Feminism and Public Life*. Ed. Jenna Mead. Milsons Point, New South Wales: Random House, 1997. 79-100.
- _____. "The Reporting Is All: The Nature and Role of the Reporting Process in a Piece of Book-length journalism." MA by project and exegesis. RMIT University, 2000.
- _____. "True Stories: The Power and Pitfalls of Literary Journalism." *Journalism: Theory in Practice*. Eds. Suellen Tapsall and Carolyn Varley. Melbourne: Oxford UP, 2001. 149-65.
- _____. "Freedom of Information and Authors: An Unsung Treasure Trove." *FOI Review* 94 (2001): 26-29.
- _____. *Writing Feature Stories: How to Research and Write Newspaper and Magazine Articles*. Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin, 2004.

- _____. ed. "Introduction." *The Best Australian Profiles*. Melbourne: Black Inc, 2004. 1-21.
- _____. "The Awkward Truth: The Perils of Writing Journalistic Books." *Overland* 176 (2004): 51-55.
- _____. "Where's the Writer? Revisiting John Bryson's *Evil Angels*." Paper for "Politics, Media, History." Australian Media Traditions conference. Old Parliament House, 24-25 November 2005.
- _____. "The Capote Conundrum." *The Age*. A2. 25 February 2006: 17-18.
- _____. "Reassessing Janet Malcolm's *The Journalist and the Murderer*." *Australian Journalism Review* 28.1 (2006): 219-28.
- _____. "Famous...in Their Own Write." *The Age*. A2. 20 January 2007: 14.
- _____. "In Search of the Real Capote." *The Age*. A2. 26 May 2007: 20.
- _____. "Drawn to Trouble." *The Age*. A2. 16 August 2008: 26-27.
- _____. "The Dearth Estate? A Question of Quality." *The Age*. Insight. 6 September 2008: 5.
- _____. "Accidental Outlaw." *The Age*. A2. 10 January 2009: 14.
- RMIT University Journalism Program. "The Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century." 9 December 1999. Retrieved on 11 March 2008. <<http://fifth.estate.rmit.edu.au/Febo4/106.html>>. Also published as "Century's Top 100." *The Australian*. Media. 9 December 1999: 6-7.
- Roberts, Andrew. "Lillian Ross." *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism: Representative Writers in an Emerging Genre*. Ed. Thomas Connery. New York: Greenwood, 1992. 231-37.
- Rodden, John. *The Politics of Literary Reputation: The Making and Claiming of "Saint George" Orwell*. New York: Oxford UP, 1989.
- Rollyson, Carl. *The Lives of Norman Mailer: A Biography*. New York: Paragon, 1991.
- Ross, Lillian. *Reporting Back: Notes on Journalism*. New York: Counterpoint, 2002.
- Rule, Andrew. "The Truth Behind *Underbelly* – or Why a Bit of Fiction Goes a Long Way." *The Sunday Age*. 10 February 2008: 5
- Rule, Rebecca and Susan Wheeler. *True Stories: Guides for Writing from Your Life*. Porstmouth: Heinemann, 2000.
- Sanders, David. *John Hersey Revisited*. Twayne's United States Authors Series No. 569. Boston: Twayne, 1990.
- Sanders, Karen. *Ethics & Journalism*. London: Sage, 2003.
- Sanders, Scott. "Introduction." *Touchstone Anthology of Contemporary Creative Nonfiction: Work from 1970 to the Present*. New York: Touchstone, 2007. xv-xvi.
- Schudson, Michael. *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- _____. *The Power of News*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1995.

- _____. "Too Much Democracy?" *Columbia Journalism Review*. September/October 1995: 59-62.
- _____. "News as Stories." *Media Anthropology*. Eds. Eric Rothenbuhler and Mihai Coman. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2005. 121-29.
- Schultz, Julianne. *Reviving the Fourth Estate: Democracy, Accountability and the Media*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Seligman, Craig. "Salon Brilliant Careers: Janet Malcolm." 29 February 2000. Retrieved on 28 September 2005. <www.salon.com/people/bc/2000/02/29/malcolm/print.html>.
- Serrin, Judith and William Serrin, eds. "Introduction." *Muckraking! The Journalism That Changed America*. New York: The New Press, 2002. xix-xxii.
- Shafer, Jack. "Newsbooks: The Triumph of a Journalism Genre." *Slate*. 11 October 2006. Retrieved on 15 May 2007. <<http://www.slate.com/toolbar.aspx?action=print&id=215127>>.
- Shapiro, Bruce, ed. "Introduction: Striking Through the Mask." *Shaking the Foundations: 200 Years of Investigative Journalism in America*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2003. xiii-xxvi.
- Shelden, Michael. *Orwell: The Authorized Biography*. 1991. London: Minerva, 1992.
- Shepard, Alicia C. *Woodward and Bernstein: Life in the Shadow of Watergate*. New Jersey: John Wiley, 2007.
- Sherman, Scott. "The Avenger: Sy Hersh, Then and Now." *Columbia Journalism Review*. July/August 2003: 34-44.
- Shields, Charles J. *Mockingbird: A Portrait of Harper Lee*. 2006. New York: Owl Books, 2007.
- Siebert, Fred S. and Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm. *Four Theories of the Press*. 1956. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1963.
- Sifton, Elisabeth. "The Second Draft of History." *Columbia Journalism Review*. September/October 2007: 54-57.
- Silvester, Christopher, ed. "Introduction." *The Penguin Book of Interviews: An Anthology from 1859 to the Present Day*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1993. 1-48.
- Simons, Margaret. "An Exercise in Creative Non-fiction and Investigative Journalism: *The Meeting of the Waters: The Hindmarsh Island Affair*." Diss. by project and exegesis. U of Technology, Sydney, 2004.
- _____. Speech about *The Meeting of the Waters*. Annual General Meeting of Free Speech Victoria. Victorian Writers' Centre, Nicholas Building, 37 Swanston Street, Melbourne. 18 May 2004.
- Sims, Norman, ed. "The Literary Journalists." *The Literary Journalists*. New York: Ballantine, 1984. 3-25.
- _____. ed. *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

- _____. "The Art of Literary Journalism." *Literary Journalism: A New Collection of the Best American Nonfiction*. Eds. Norman Sims and Mark Kramer. New York: Ballantine, 1995. 3-19.
- Sims, Norman and Mark Kramer, eds. *Literary Journalism: A New Collection of the Best American Nonfiction*. New York: Ballantine, 1995.
- _____. *True Stories: A Century of Literary Journalism*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2007.
- Siskind, Amy. "Telling Tales, Naming Names: My Experience as Apostate and Ethnographer of the Sullivan Institute/Fourth Wall Community." *Toward Reflexive Ethnography: Participating, Observing, Narrating*. Eds. David Bromley and Lewis Carter. Amsterdam: JAI, 2001. 181-96.
- Smith, Kathy. "John McPhee Balances the Act." *Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Norman Sims. New York: Oxford UP, 1990. 206-27.
- Smith, Ron. *Groping for Ethics in Journalism*. 5th ed. Iowa: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- Smith, Sarah Harrison. *The Fact Checker's Bible*. New York: Anchor, 2004.
- The Smoking Gun. "A Million Little Lies: Exposing James Frey's Fiction Addiction." Retrieved on 20 April 2006.
<www.thesmokinggun.com/archive/0104061jamesfrey1.html>. 8 January 2006.
- Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics. Retrieved on 31 January 2008.
<<http://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp>>.
- Stanton, Robert. *Truman Capote: A Primary and Secondary Bibliography*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980.
- Steger, Jason. "It's Fiction and that's a Fact." *The Age*. A2. 29 March 2008: 24-25.
- Steinem, Gloria. "A Visit with Truman Capote." *Truman Capote: Conversations*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1987. 73-81.
- Stephens, Mitchell. *A History of News*. 1988. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Stone, Albert. *Literary Aftershocks: American Writers, Readers, and the Bomb*. New York: Twayne, 1994.
- Stone, I.F. "A Louis XIV – in all but Style." *In a Time of Torment*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1968. 62-68.
- Stoppard, Tom. *Night and Day*. London: Faber, 1978.
- Symons, Emma-Kate. Rev. of *Joe Cinque's Consolation*, by Helen Garner. "Inside the Skin." *The Weekend Australian*. Review. 21 August 2004: 11.
- Talese, Gay. "Author's Foreword." *Fame and Obscurity*. 1970. New York: Ivy Books, 1993.
- Talese, Gay and Barbara Lounsberry, eds. *Writing Creative Nonfiction: The Literature of Reality*. New York: HarperCollins, 1996.
- _____. "The Silent Season of a Hero." *The Best American Sports Writing of the Century*. Series ed. Glenn Stout. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999. 3-22.

- _____. "Frank Sinatra Has a Cold." *Esquire's* *Big Book of Great Writing: More than 70 Years of Celebrated Journalism*. Ed. Adrienne Miller. New York: Hearst, 2003. 583-622
- Tanner, Stephen, Molly Kasinger and Nick Richardson. "Book-length Writing: Creative Non-fiction." *Feature Writing: (Telling the Story)*. South Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford UP, 2009. 344-57.
- Tapsall, Suellen and Carolyn Varley, eds. *Journalism: Theory in Practice*. Melbourne: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Taylor, Anthea. "Stones, Ripples, Waves: Refiguring *The First Stone* Media Event." Diss. U of New South Wales, 2005.
- Taylor, D.J. *Orwell: The Life*. 2003. London: Vintage, 2004.
- Tebbel, John and Mary Ellen Zuckerman. *The Magazine in America 1741-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Thompson, Hunter. *The Proud Highway: Saga of a Desperate Southern Gentleman 1955-1967*. Ed, Douglas Brinkley. 1997. London: Bloomsbury, 1998.
- _____. *Fear and Loathing in America: The Brutal Odyssey of an Outlaw Journalist 1968-1976*. Ed. Douglas Brinkley. London: Bloomsbury, 2000.
- Tompkins, Phillip K. "In Cold Fact." *Esquire*, June 1966: 125, 127, 166-68, 170-71.
- Toohey, Brian. "Stone's Bad-throw: Six-into-one Doesn't Go." *The Australian Financial Review*. 5 September 1995: 17.
- Topping, Seymour. "History of the Pulitzer Prizes." 1999. Updated by Sig Gissler, 2008. Retrieved on 14 April 2009. <<http://www.pulitzer.org/historyofprizes>>.
- Trimble, Joseph and Celia Fisher, eds. *The Handbook of Ethical Research with Ethnocultural Populations and Communities*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2006.
- Tynan, Kenneth. *Tynan Right and Left*. London: Longmans, 1967.
- Vandenberg, Peter. "An Exposition on Narrative: Retiring Journalism in Creative Writing." *Points of Entry*. 3 (2005): 195-204.
- Van Maanen, John, ed. *Representation in Ethnography*. London: Sage, 1995.
- Wakefield, Dan. *Between the Lines: A Reporter's Personal Journey Through Public Events*. Boston: Little Brown, 1966.
- The Walkley magazine*. "2007 Walkley Awards for Excellence in Journalism." Best Non-fiction book: Judges' comments. December 2007/January 2008. 63.
- The Walkley awards winners database. Retrieved on 15 June 2009. <<http://www.walkleys.com/winners/database.html>>.
- "Wealthy Farmer, 3 of Family Slain." *The New York Times*. 16 November 1959. Retrieved on 23 April 2006. <<http://www.nytimes.com/books/97/12/28/home/capote-headline.html>>.
- Weber, Ronald, ed. *The Reporter as Artist: A Look at the New Journalism Controversy*. New York: Hastings House, 1974.
- _____. *The Literature of Fact: Literary Nonfiction in American Writing*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1980.

- Weinberg, Steve. *Telling the Untold Story: How Investigative Reporters are Changing the Craft of Biography*. Missouri: U of Missouri P, 1992.
- _____ "The Secret Sharer." *Mother Jones*. May/June 1992: 52-59.
- _____ "Why Books Err So Often." *Columbia Journalism Review*. July/August 1998: 52-56.
- _____ "The Book as an Investigative Vehicle for News." *Nieman Reports*. Spring 2007. Retrieved on 17 December 2007.
<<http://www.nieman.harvard.edu/reports/07-1NRspring/p104-0701-weinberg.html>>.
- _____ *Taking on the Trust: The Epic Battle of Ida Tarbell and John D. Rockefeller*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2008.
- Weingarten, Marc. *From Hipsters to Gonzo: How New Journalism Rewrote the World*. Carlton: Scribe, 2005. Published in the United States under the title *The Gang That Wouldn't Write Straight: Wolfe, Thompson, Didion and the New Journalism Revolution*.
- Weisberg, Jacob. "The Decline of Rumsfeld." *Slate*. 4 October 2006. Retrieved on 15 May 2007. <<http://www.slate.com/toolbar.aspx?action=print&id=2150953>>.
- Wenner, Jann S. and Corey Seymour, eds. *Gonzo: The Life of Hunter S. Thompson*. London: Sphere, 2007.
- White, E.B. "An Approach to Style." 1959. Eds. William Strunk and E.B. White. *The Elements of Style*. New York: Macmillan, 1962. 52-71.
- White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978. 81-100.
- _____ *The Content of the Form: Historical Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.
- _____ "Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth." *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"*. Ed. Saul Friedlander. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1992. 37-53.
- White, Sally. *Reporting in Australia*. 2nd ed. Melbourne: Macmillan, 1996.
- Wilkins, Lee and Clifford Christians. *The Handbook of Mass Media Ethics*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Williams, Linda. "The Ethics of Representation: Dennis O'Rourke's *The Good Woman of Bangkok*." *Collecting Visible Evidence*. Eds. Jane Gaines and Michael Renov Minneapolis: U of Minneapolis P, 1999. 176-89.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords*. London: Fontana, 1976.
- Williford, Lex and Michael Martone, eds. "Foreword." *Touchstone Anthology of Contemporary Creative Nonfiction: Work from 1970 to the Present*. New York: Touchstone, 2007. xi-xiv.
- Wilson, Ashleigh and Murray Waldren. "Books on Falconio Racing into Print." *The Australian*. 7 December 2005: 7.
- Windham, Donald. *Lost Friends: A Memoir of Truman Capote, Tennessee Williams, and Others*. New York: William Morrow, 1987.

- Wolfe, Tom. "The New Journalism." *The New Journalism*. 1973. Eds. Tom Wolfe and E.W. Johnson. London: Picador, 1975. 15-68.
- _____. "Stalking the Billion-Footed Beast." *The Bonfire of the Vanities*. 1987. London: Picador, 1988. vii-xxx.
- _____. "The New Yorker Affair." *Hooking Up*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2000. 247-93.
- _____. "10 Questions." *Time*. 8 September 2008: 4.
- Yagoda, Ben. "Preface." *The Art of Fact: A Historical Anthology of Literary Journalism*. Eds. Kevin Kerrane and Ben Yagoda. New York: Scribner, 1997. 13-16.
- _____. *About Town: "The New Yorker" and the World It Made*. New York: Scribner, 2000.
- _____. *The Sound on the Page: Great Writers Talk about Style and Voice in Writing*. New York: HarperCollins, 2004.
- Zavarzadeh, Mas'ud. *The Mythopoeic Reality: The Postwar American Nonfiction Novel*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1976.
- Zelizer, Barbie. *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2004.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Book-length journalism on the *Publishers Weekly* annual top ten non-fiction bestseller list 1960 to 2008

The magazine's annual non-fiction bestseller lists are archived decade by decade and can be found at www.caderbooks.com. The magazine prints bestsellers lists each week but does not store its annual bestseller lists at Cader Books until the end of a decade. For the years since 2000 I have relied on survey articles in the magazine about bestsellers via its website (www.publishersweekly.com) but the formatting of the annual bestseller lists has been through various changes making it difficult to achieve full consistency. The criteria for regarding the works listed below as book-length journalism are spelt out in chapter two; I acknowledge the criteria are constructed rather than natural. For example, the list of the Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century includes *Angela's Ashes*, which was written by a former teacher, Frank McCourt, and was marketed as an autobiography. It did reach the *Publishers Weekly* top ten for 1997 but is excluded from this appendix because it is not primarily, in my assessment, a work of journalism. Conversely, *The Last Battle* is in this appendix even though it is a reconstruction of a World War II battle; it is included because its author, Cornelius Ryan, reported on the war, because he did numerous interviews specifically for the book and because it is written in a narrative mode. In recent years books by Bill O'Reilly and Christopher Hitchens have reached the bestseller lists. These books are polemical and while they are not the focus of discussion in this thesis, the authors are identified as journalists and have produced what might be termed book-length opinion columns. All these choices, and others, are open to debate. The key point is that for at least half a century a significant minority of works of book-length journalism have been major bestsellers.

1961:

Theodore H. White: *The Making of the President 1960*

1965:

Theodore H. White: *The Making of the President 1964*

1966:

Truman Capote: *In Cold Blood*

Mark Lane: *Rush to Judgment*

Cornelius Ryan: *The Last Battle*

1967:

William Manchester: *Death of a President*

1968:

Adam Smith: *The Money Game*

1969:

Joe McGinniss: *The Selling of the President*

1971:

Gay Talese: *Honor Thy Father*

1974:

Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward: *All the President's Men*

1975:

Theodore H. White: *Breach of Faith: The Fall of Richard Nixon*

1976:

Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein: *The Final Days*

Gail Sheehy: *Passages: The Predictable Crises of Adult Life*

1979:

Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong: *The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court*

1980:

Gay Talese: *Thy Neighbor's Wife*

1983:

Ken Follett: *On Wings of Eagles*

1986:

Kitty Kelley: *His Way: The Unauthorized Biography of Frank Sinatra*

1987:

Bob Woodward: *Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA, 1981-1987*

1991:

Kitty Kelley: *Nancy Reagan: The Unauthorized Biography*

James B. Stewart: *Den of Thieves*

1992:

Andrew Morton: *Diana: Her True Story*

Gail Sheehy: *Silent Passage*

1997:

John Berendt: *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*

Kitty Kelley: *The Royals*

Andrew Morton: *Diana: Her True Story*

Jon Krakauer: *Into Thin Air*

1998:

Mitch Albom: *Tuesdays with Morrie*

Tom Brokaw: *The Greatest Generation*

2000:

Malcolm Gladwell: *The Tipping Point*

Bill O'Reilly: *The O'Reilly Factor*

2001:

Bill O'Reilly: *The No Spin Zone: Confrontations with the Powerful and Famous in America*

2002:

Bob Woodward: *Bush at War*

2003:

Al Franken: *Lies (And the Lying Liars Who Tell Them): A Fair and Balanced Look at the Right*

Michael Moore: *Dude, Where's My Country*

2005:

Thomas L. Friedman: *The World is Flat*

Malcolm Gladwell: *Blink*

2006:

Bob Woodward: *State of Denial: Bush at War, Part III*

2007:

Christopher Hitchens: *God Is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*

2008:

Malcolm Gladwell: *Outliers: The Story of Success*

Thomas L. Friedman: *Hot, Flat and Crowded*

APPENDIX B – Questionnaire for Australian practitioners of book-length journalism

List of topics and questions for interviewees:

A. Overview of the interviewee's career as a journalist and as a novelist:

1. Interviewees will be encouraged to outline the nature and range of their book-length journalism.
2. What do you consider to be the characteristics of book-length journalism?
3. How is it similar and how is it different from newspaper and magazine journalism?
4. How do you think of your journalism compared to your fiction? Do you see them existing in two separate domains, or as activities along a continuum, or as something else?
5. What do you think book-length journalism provide readers that daily print journalism does not?
6. What ethical issues do you think arise for practitioners of book-length journalism? In what ways do you think they are similar and in what ways different from those that arise in daily print journalism?

B. The research phase of a work of book-length journalism:

7. How have you gone about generating ideas for book-length journalism?
8. What kinds of issues or stories do you think are more likely to be capable of sustaining a work of book-length journalism?
9. How much time have you spent working on individual book-length journalism projects? Is it important for you to have more time than is available to daily print journalists?
10. What methods did you use to gather material for your book-length journalism? (IE, interviews, documents, first hand observation). In what ways, if any, did your methods differ from those you used in daily journalism?
11. Did the length of time you spent working on a book-length project affect the kind of relationship you had with the people you were writing about? If so, how? If so, did it help the book or hinder it?
12. How much time did you spend observing the subjects of your book first hand? Was this work valuable for the book? Did it pose any ethical issues?

C. The writing phase of a work of book-length journalism:

13. In writing book-length journalism, how conscious were you about the potential to draw on methods and approaches usually associated with fiction? If so, how important was it to the book?
14. Do you approach writing a work of book-length journalism and writing a work of fiction in the same way, or differently?
15. In describing people in your book-length journalism, how do you strike a balance between intimacy, honesty, fairness and balance?
16. How have you dealt with describing events you have not observed for yourself? Have you written full-scale reconstructions in the way that, say, Truman Capote did in *In Cold Blood*? If so, how did you go about verifying your account?
17. How have you handled attribution of information in your book-length journalism? How do you balance the need to attribute information to its source with the demands of narrative flow?
18. Is it possible in book-length journalism to write interior monologues for people? If you believe it is, how do you do it and how do you respond to criticisms from a practitioner like John McPhee who believes journalists should not get inside their subjects' heads and think for them?
19. Is it acceptable to create composite characters in book-length journalism? If you believe it is, under what circumstances?

D. The reception of a work of book-length journalism:

20. What expectations do you believe readers have of book-length journalism?
21. Several practitioners of book-length journalism, such as John Hersey and Janet Malcolm, have described the relationship between writers and readers of book-length journalism as a "contract" based on trust. Do you have such a contract in mind when you write book-length journalism? If so, what are its defining elements?
22. Are there particular methods that practitioners of book-length journalism can draw on to build the trust with readers? Such as endnotes, lists of sources, notes to readers, and so on, or do you believe this kind of additional material is unnecessary?
23. Sometimes book-length works of journalism are praised for "reading like a novel." Is this a comment you welcome about your book-length journalism? What kind of reading experience do you hope your audience will have?
24. Implicit in many of these questions is the notion that fiction and book-length journalism are separate domains, but readers can have difficulty distinguishing between the two, especially if they are given unclear or misleading signals, as occurred in John Berendt's *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*. Do you agree?

25. Various postmodernist and poststructural theorists such as Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida have argued that the lines between reality and how it is represented are nowhere near as clear-cut as was once thought. Have you been conscious of these theories as you have created book-length journalism? If so, in what ways?

APPENDIX C – Book-length journalism included in the lists of the best American and the best Australian journalism of the twentieth century

Book-length journalism was included in the **Best American Journalism of the Twentieth Century**, a list chosen by a panel of experts assembled by New York University's Journalism department, who ranked the works from one to a hundred. Of the one hundred works chosen, thirty-eight, or more than a third, were books. Of these, twenty-three were created as book-length works and fifteen were long magazine articles published as books or magazines articles or newspaper series extended to book length. The list of thirty-eight does not include shorter magazine articles collected and published in book form, such as Joseph Mitchell's *Up in the Old Hotel and Other Stories*, which was ranked thirty-sixth on the list. The list below is of the thirty-eight works, with their original ranking. The full list is available at: <http://www.infoplease.com/ipea/A0777379.html>.

1. **John Hersey:** *Hiroshima*, *The New Yorker*, 1946. Magazine article. Rank: 1
2. **Rachel Carson:** *Silent Spring*, *The New Yorker*, 1962. Magazine articles. Rank: 2
3. **Ida Tarbell:** *The History of the Standard Oil Company*, *McClure's*, 1902–1904. Magazine articles. Rank: 5.
4. **Lincoln Steffens:** *The Shame of the Cities*, *McClure's*, 1902–1904. Magazine articles. Rank: 6.
5. **John Reed:** *Ten Days That Shook the World*, 1919. Magazine articles. Rank: 7.
6. **Seymour Hersh:** Investigation of a massacre by American soldiers at My Lai in Vietnam, Dispatch News Service, 1969. Newspaper articles extended to a book, *My Lai 4: A Report on the Massacre and its Aftermath*, published in 1970. Rank: 12.
7. **James Agee and Walker Evans:** *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men*, 1941. Book. Rank: 14.
8. **Tom Wolfe:** *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, 1968. Book. Rank: 18.
9. **Norman Mailer:** *The Armies of the Night*, 1968. Magazine articles. Rank: 19.
10. **Hannah Arendt:** *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, 1963. Magazine articles. Rank: 20.
11. **Truman Capote:** *In Cold Blood*, 1965. Magazine articles. Rank: 22.
12. **Michael Herr:** *Dispatches*, 1977. Magazine articles. Rank: 25.
13. **Theodore White:** *The Making of the President: 1960*, 1961. Book. Rank: 26.
14. **J. Anthony Lukas:** *Common Ground: A Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families*, 1985. Book. Rank: 28.
15. **James Baldwin:** *The Fire Next Time*, 1963. Book. Rank: 35.

16. **Betty Friedan:** *The Feminine Mystique*, 1963. Book. Rank: 37.
17. **Ralph Nader:** *Unsafe at Any Speed: The Designed-In Dangers of the American Automobile*, 1965. Book. Rank: 38.
18. **Neil Sheehan:** *A Bright Shining Lie: John Paul Vann and America in Vietnam*, 1988. Book. Rank: 46.
19. **Tom Wolfe:** *The Right Stuff*, 1979. Book. Rank: 48.
20. **Murray Kempton:** *Part of Our Time: Some Ruins and Monuments of the Thirties*, 1955. Book. Rank: 50.
21. **Taylor Branch:** *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, 1954–1963*, 1988. Book. Rank: 52.
22. **John McPhee:** *The John McPhee Reader*, 1976. Selected excerpts from magazine articles that were later published as books. Rank: 54.
23. **David Remnick:** *Lenin's Tomb: The Last Days of the Soviet Empire*, 1993. Book. Rank: 57.
24. **Richard Ben Cramer:** *What It Takes: The Way to the White House*, 1992. Book. Rank: 58.
25. **Jonathan Schell:** *The Fate of the Earth*, 1982. Magazine articles. Rank: 59.
26. **Nicholas Lemann:** *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*, 1991. Book. Rank: 67.
27. **Norman Mailer:** *The Executioner's Song*, 1979. Book. Rank: 72.
28. **Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein:** *All the President's Men*, 1974. Book. Rank: 75.
29. **A. J. Liebling:** *The Earl of Louisiana*, 1961. Book. Rank: 77.
30. **Mike Davis:** *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, 1990. Book. Rank: 78.
31. **Melissa Fay Greene:** *Praying for Sheetrock*, 1991. Book. Rank: 79.
32. **Lillian Ross:** *Picture*, 1952. Magazine articles. Rank: 85.
33. **Greil Marcus:** *Mystery Train: Images of America in Rock 'n' Roll Music*, 1975. Book. Rank: 87.
34. **Leon Dash:** "Rosa Lee's Story," *The Washington Post*, 1994. Newspaper articles later extended to a book. Rank: 90.
35. **Frank McCourt:** *Angela's Ashes*, 1996. Book. Rank: 95.
36. **Vincent Sheean:** *Personal History*, 1935. Book. Rank: 96.
37. **Joe McGinniss:** *The Selling of the President 1968*, 1969. Book. Rank 99.
38. **Hunter S. Thompson:** *Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72*, 1973. Magazine articles. Rank: 100.

Book-length journalism was included in the **Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century**, a list chosen by a panel of industry and academic experts assembled by RMIT University's Journalism program. Of the one hundred that were chosen, but not ranked in order, fourteen were works of book-length journalism. They are listed below in chronological order. The list does not contain any magazine articles that were published as books or extended to book-length, as the magazine writing tradition is not as well developed in Australia as it is in the United States. The full list is available at: <http://fifth.estate.rmit.edu.au/Febo4/106.html>.

1. **C.E.W. Bean:** *Letters from France*, 1917.
2. **Warren Denning:** *Caucus Crisis*, 1937.
3. **Alan Moorehead:** *African Trilogy*, 1945.
4. **Osmar White:** *Green Armour*, 1945.
5. **Rohan Rivett:** *Behind Bamboo*, 1945.
6. **Donald Horne:** *The Lucky Country*, 1964.
7. **Robert Hughes:** *The Art of Australia*, 1966.
8. **Paul Kelly:** *The Dismissal*, 1978, and *The End of Certainty*, 1993.
9. **John Bryson:** *Evil Angels*, 1985.
10. **Paul Chadwick:** *Media Mates: Carving Up Australia's Media*, 1989.
11. **Gideon Haigh:** *The Cricket War*, 1993 and *The Summer Game*, 1997.
12. **Martin Flanagan:** *Southern Sky, Western Oval*, 1994.
13. **Marian Wilkinson:** *The Fixer: The Untold Story of Graham Richardson*, 1996
14. **Pamela Williams:** *The Victory*, 1997.

APPENDIX D – Book-length journalism that has won the Pulitzer prize for general non-fiction between 1962 and 2008

As with lists in other appendices, my designation of the works below as book-length journalism is open to debate. I have followed the criteria set out in chapter two but am aware that some would question the inclusion of Richard Rhodes' history of the development of the atomic bomb. I have included it because he uses journalistic methods in his research, writes in a narrative mode and has been included in Norman Sims' anthology *The Literary Journalists*. Similarly, Samantha Power's prominent and controversial role in Barack Obama's presidential campaign and her subsequent appointment to President Obama's National Security Council have obscured her earlier work as a journalist as well as human rights activist (http://www.law.harvard.edu/news/2009/01/30_power.html). *The Problem from Hell* originated in her reporting work in Bosnia during the civil war in the 1990s and she regards the book as both investigative reporting and history (Power "Crossing Over: From Advocacy to Narrative" 281-84). The full list is available at <http://www.pulitzer.org/bycat/General+Nonfiction>.

1982:

Tracy Kidder: *The Soul of a New Machine*

1983:

Susan Sheehan: *Is There No Place On Earth For Me?*

1986:

Joseph Lelyveld: *Move Your Shadow: South Africa, Black and White*

J. Anthony Lukas: *Common Ground: A Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families*

1987:

David K. Shipler: *Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land*

1988:

Richard Rhodes: *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*

1989:

Neil Sheehan: *A Bright Shining Lie: John Paul Vann and America in Vietnam*

1990:

Dale Maharidge and Michael Williamson: *And Their Children after Them*

1994:

David Remnick: *Lenin's Tomb: The Last Days of the Soviet Empire*

1996:

Tina Rosenberg: *The Haunted Land: Facing Europe's Ghosts After Communism*

1999:

John McPhee: *Annals of the Former World*

2002:

Diane McWhorter: *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama, the Climactic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*

2003:

Samantha Power: *"A Problem From Hell": America and the Age of Genocide*

2005:

Steve Coll: *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*

2007:

Lawrence Wright: *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda's Road to 9/11*

APPENDIX E – Australian book-length journalism on the Nielsen BookScan annual list of top fifty non-fiction bestsellers between 2002 and 2008

Nielsen BookScan's sales data is sold to media outlets but annual lists are generally not made public. It has been provided to me by Michael Webster, principal consultant in Australia for Nielsen BookScan. As with the *Publishers Weekly* bestseller lists, I have made decisions about what to include and what to exclude that are open to debate. I have included Paul Ham's *Vietnam: the Australian War* even though it concerns events that took place several decades ago, but was persuaded by Ham's practice of interviewing numerous veterans and his commitment to making fresh disclosures about the war.

2002:

Sarah MacDonald: *Holy Cow! An Indian Adventure*

Mike Coward: *The Chappell Years*

2003:

Graeme Blundell: *King: The Life and Comedy of Graham Kennedy*

2004:

Helen Garner: *Joe Cinque's Consolation*

Robert Drewe: *The Shark Net*

Peter FitzSimons: *Steve Waugh*

Margo Kingston: *Not Happy, John: Defending Our Democracy*

2005:

Ian McPhedran: *The Amazing SAS: The Inside Story of Australia's Special Forces*

Tim Flannery: *The Weather Makers: The History and Future Impact of Climate Change*

Helen Garner: *Joe Cinque's Consolation*

2006:

Chris Masters: *Jonestown: The Power and the Myth of Alan Jones*

Sandra Lee: *18 Hours: The True Story of an SAS Hero*

Tony Wright: *Bad Ground: Inside the Beaconsfield Mine Rescue*

Paul Barry: *Spun Out: the Shane Warne story*

2007:

Gerald Stone: *Who Killed Channel 9? The Death of Kerry Packer's Mighty TV Dream Machine*

Paul Ham: *Vietnam: The Australian War*

Paul Barry: *The Rise and Rise of Kerry Packer Uncut*

2008:

John Silvester and Andrew Rule: *Underbelly: The Gangland War*

John Silvester and Andrew Rule: *Leadbelly: Inside Australia's Underworld Wars*

APPENDIX F – Book-length journalism that has won the Queensland Premier’s Literary award for advancing public debate between 1999 and 2008

The full list of winners of this award is available at:

http://www.premiers.qld.gov.au/awardsevents/awards/Queensland_Premiers_Literary_awards/About_the_Literary_Awards/.

2001:

Peter Mares: *Borderline: Australia’s Treatment of Refugees and Asylum Seekers*

2002:

Michael Gordon: *Reconciliation: A Journey*

2003:

David Marr and Marian Wilkinson: *Dark Victory*

2006:

Gideon Haigh: *Asbestos House: The Secret History of James Hardie Industries*

2007:

Chris Masters: *Jonestown: The Power and the Myth of Alan Jones*

APPENDIX G – Notable works of Australian book-length journalism

The criteria for inclusion in this list is that the work of book-length journalism stands out for any one or more of the following reasons: volume of sales; critically well received; award-winner; listed in the Best Australian Journalism of the Twentieth Century; it was innovative; recommendation to me by colleagues in publishing or journalism, notably Gideon Haigh, whose unpublished paper on Australian book-length journalism was especially helpful. Acknowledging the ultimately subjective nature of such lists, a small number of works are included mainly because I feel they should be. Some practitioners have written numerous works of book-length journalism, but though many of their works are worth reading I have limited their number here to two.

Mark Aarons: *War Criminals Welcome*, 2001.

Paul Barry: *The Rise and Fall of Alan Bond*, 1990.

Paul Barry: *The Rise and Rise of Kerry Packer*, 1993.

Michael Bachelard: *Behind the Exclusive Brethren*, 2008.

C.E.W. Bean: *Back on the Wool Track*, 1925.

Estelle Blackburn: *Broken Lives*, 1998.

Graeme Blundell: *King: The Life and Comedy of Graham Kennedy*, 2003.

Geraldine Brooks: *Nine Parts of Desire: The Hidden World of Islamic Women*, 1994.

John Bryson: *Evil Angels*, 1985.

Wilfred Burchett: *Rebel Journalism: The Writings of Wilfred Burchett*, edited by George Burchett and Nick Shimmin, 2007.

Paul Chadwick: *Media Mates: Carving Up Australia's Media*, 1989.

Neil Chenoweth: *Packer's Lunch*, 2006.

Paul Cleary: *Shakedown: Australia's Grab for Timor Oil*, 2007.

Bob Connolly: *Making "Black Harvest": Warfare, Filmmaking and Living Dangerously in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea*, 2005.

Mike Coward: *The Chappell Years*, 2002.

- d'Alpuget, Blanche:** *Robert J. Hawke: A Biography*, 1982.
- Dale, John:** *Huckstepp: A Dangerous Life*, 2000.
- Warren Denning:** *Caucus Crisis*, 1937.
- Bruce Dover:** *Rupert's Adventures in China: How Murdoch Lost a Fortune and Gained a Wife*, 2008.
- Robert Drewe:** *The Shark Net*, 2000.
- Keith Dunstan:** *Ratbags*, 1979.
- Martin Flanagan:** *Southern Sky, Western Oval*, 1994.
- Tim Flannery:** *The Weather Makers: The History and Future Impact of Climate Change*, 2005.
- Anna Funder:** *Stasiland*, 2002.
- Helen Garner:** *The First Stone*, 1995.
- Helen Garner:** *Joe Cinque's Consolation*, 2004.
- Harry Gordon:** *The Time of our Lives: Inside the Sydney Olympics*, 2003.
- Michael Gordon:** *Reconciliation: A Journey*, 2002.
- Michelle Grattan:** *Back on the Wool Track*, 2004.
- Gideon Haigh:** *The Cricket War: The Inside story of Kerry Packer's World Series Cricket*, 1993.
- Gideon Haigh:** *Asbestos House: The Secret History of James Hardie Industries*, 2006.
- Paul Ham:** *Vietnam: The Australian War*, 2007.
- Robert Haupt:** *Last Boat to Astrakhan: A Russian Memoir 1990-1996*, 1998.
- David Hickie:** *The Prince and the Premier*, 1985.
- Barry Hill:** *Sitting In*, 1991.
- Ernestine Hill:** *The Great Australian Loneliness*, 1937.
- Chloe Hooper:** *The Tall Man: Death and Life on Palm Island*, 2008.
- Donald Horne:** *The Lucky Country*, 1964.

- Robert Hughes:** *The Art of Australia*, 1966.
- Ken Inglis:** *The Stuart Case*, 1961. Revised and expanded, 2002.
- Paul Kelly:** *The Hawke Ascendancy*, 1984.
- Paul Kelly:** *The End of Certainty*, 1993.
- Tom Keneally:** *Schindler's Ark*, 1982.
- Margo Kingston:** *Not Happy, John: Defending Our Democracy*, 2004.
- Karen Kissane:** *Silent Death: The Killing of Julie Ramage*, 2006.
- Phillip Knightley:** *The First Casualty*, 1975. Revised and expanded, 2000 and 2003.
- Phillip Knightley:** *Philby: The Life and Views of the KGB Masterspy*, 1988.
- Malcolm Knox:** *Secrets of the Jury Room*, 2005.
- Sandra Lee:** *18 Hours: The True Story of an SAS hero*, 2006.
- Garry Linnell:** *Playing God: The Rise and Fall of Gary Ablett*, 2003.
- Kimina Lyall:** *Out of the Blue: Facing the Tsunami*, 2006.
- Sarah MacDonald:** *Holy Cow! An Indian Adventure*, 2002.
- Paul McGeough:** *Manhattan to Baghdad*, 2003.
- Adrian McGregor:** *Cathy: A Biography of Cathy Freeman* 1998.
- Craig McGregor:** *Profile of Australia*, 1966.
- Craig McGregor:** *Time of Testing: The Bob Hawke Victory*, 1983.
- Ian McPhedran:** *The Amazing SAS: The Inside Story of Australia's Special Forces*, 2005.
- Peter Mares:** *Borderline: Australia's Treatment of Refugees and Asylum Seekers*, 2001.
- David Marr:** *The Ivanov Trail*, 1984.
- David Marr and Marian Wilkinson:** *Dark Victory*, 2003.
- Chris Masters:** *Jonestown: The Power and the Myth of Alan Jones*, 2006.
- George Megalogenis:** *The Longest Decade*, 2006,

Alan Moorehead: *African Trilogy*, 1945.

George Ernest Morrison: *An Australian in China: Being the Narrative of a Quiet Journey across China to Burma*, 1895.

George Munster: *Rupert Murdoch: A Paper Prince*, 1985.

Sally Neighbour: *In the Shadow of Swords: On the Trail of Terrorism from Afghanistan to Australia*, 2004.

Cyril Pearl: *The Dunera Scandal*, 1983.

John Pilger: *Heroes*, 1986.

John Powers: *The Coach: A Season with Ron Barrassi*, 1978.

Alan Reid: *The Gorton Experiment*, 1971; *The Whitlam Venture*, 1976.

Rohan Rivett: *Behind Bamboo*, 1945.

Andrew Rule: *Cuckoo: A True Story of Murder and its Detection*, 1988.

Leigh Sales: *Detainee 002: The Case of David Hicks*, 2007.

John Silvester and Andrew Rule: *Underbelly: The Gangland War*, 2008.

Margaret Simons: *Fit to Print: Inside the Canberra Press Gallery*, 1999

Margaret Simons: *The Meeting of the Waters: the Hindmarsh Island Affair*, 2003.

Colin Simpson: *Adam in Ochre: Inside Aboriginal Australia*, 1951.

Gerald Stone: *Who Killed Channel 9? The Death of Kerry Packer's Mighty TV Dream Machine*, 2007.

Trevor Sykes: *The Bold Riders*, 1994.

Hedley Thomas: *Sick to Death*, 2007.

Paul Toohey: *The Killer Within: Inside the World of Bradley John Murdoch*, 2007.

Helen Trinca and Anne Davies: *Waterfront: The Battle That Changed Australia*, 2000.

Christine Wallace: *Greer: Untamed Shrew*, 1997.

Osmar White: *Green Armour*, 1945.

Mark Whittaker and Les Kennedy: *Sins of the Brother: The Definitive Story of Ivan Milat and the Backpacker Murders*, 1998.

Evan Whitton: *Trial by Voodoo: Why the Law Defeats Justice & Democracy*, 1994.

Marian Wilkinson: *The Fixer: The Untold Story of Graham Richardson*, 1996.

Pamela Williams: *The Victory: The Inside Story of the Takeover of Australia*, 1997.

Chester Wilmot: *The Struggle for Europe*, 1952.

Tony Wright: *Bad Ground: Inside the Beaconsfield Mine Rescue*, 2006.