

# *Asia Pacific Media Educator*

---

*Issue 18*

2007

*Article 9*

---

## More than a magazine, more than people: Esquire and the publishing conditions of literary journalism in the 1960s

A. Zinke\*

\*Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

Copyright ©2007. *Asia Pacific Media Educator*. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/apme>

# More than a magazine, more than people: Esquire and the publishing conditions of literary journalism in the 1960s

A. Zinke

## **Abstract**

Typically, research and writing on literary journalism center either on anecdotes and memoirs of individual authors and their writings or on the attempt to write a comprehensive history or theory of the form. Both have their shortcomings for approaching the field. The method of analyzing Esquire as a platform for literary journalism proposed by this article presents a combination of both approaches based on Alberto Melucci's network theory. Based on the understanding of the 1960's literary journalism as a movement, Melucci's approach provides the groundwork for analyzing the networks of writers and editors in their respective "field of opportunities and constraints" (1989: 26). This helps scholars investigate the comprehensive conditions out of which narrative forms develop but also benefits students and authors in providing a realistic understanding of publishing circumstances for their own work.

# More than a magazine, more than people: Esquire and the publishing conditions of literary journalism in the 1960s

**Anja Zinke,**

*Freie Universität Berlin, Germany*

---

## Abstract

Typically, research and writing on literary journalism center either on anecdotes and memoirs of individual authors and their writings or on the attempt to write a comprehensive history or theory of the form. Both have their shortcomings for approaching the field. The method of analyzing *Esquire* as a platform for literary journalism proposed by this article presents a combination of both approaches based on Alberto Melucci's network theory. Based on the understanding of the 1960's literary journalism as a movement, Melucci's approach provides the groundwork for analyzing the networks of writers and editors in their respective "field of opportunities and constraints" (1989: 26). This helps scholars investigate the comprehensive conditions out of which narrative forms develop but also benefits students and authors in providing a realistic understanding of publishing circumstances for their own work.

## Introduction

Research and writing on literary journalism seem to center either on anecdotes and memoirs of individual authors or on the attempt to write a comprehensive history or theory of the form. Both these approaches have their shortcomings. The individual memoirs and anecdotes help understand the cultural setting but lack theoretical insight, whereas the comprehensive theories are often too text-centered, focusing entirely on the writing while excluding an analysis of the circumstances of production.<sup>1</sup> Weingarten's (2006) account of the 1960s journalism as an example of the anecdotal does not distinguish by definition between Norman Mailer's and Gay Talese's writing. However Yagoda and Kerrane's theoretical introduction to the anthology *The Art of Fact* (1995) serves as a representative example of the problematic nature of the theoretical mode. In reference to the literary journalism of the 1960s, Yagoda states in the introduction that "much of this fresh writing was, first and foremost, a direct response to the transforming events of the era" (1995: 18), but does not further elaborate on this. Instead he tries to define the term and group writers into different traditions of style. Both methods therefore also have problems accounting for the shifts and changes of popularity of literary journalism. The anecdotal histories grant changes to the influence of great personalities and their investment in the form. The comprehensive histories concentrate on textual characteristics and do not focus on the extra-textual conditions.

To illustrate the significance of publishing circumstances in the emergence of literary journalism as a popular form, this article concentrates on a comprehensive analysis of these conditions for *Esquire* magazine's network during the 1960s based on Alberto Melucci's theory of social movements.

Since neither the attempt to accredit individual writers for literary journalism's emergence nor the attempt to theorize this "profoundly fuzzy term" (Yagoda: 1997: 13) ultimately appear fruitful, this article demonstrates the social construction of the genre by examining the conditions out of which literary journalism emerged in the pages of what Weingarten refers to as "the most influential magazine of the 1960s" (2006: 40). This helps scholars investigate the conditions and settings out of which narrative forms develop or rise to prominence at particular points in time, but also benefits students and authors in providing a realistic understanding of publishing circumstances for their own work.

---

## Theory and Method

### Why Melucci?

The network approach as introduced by Melucci in his revision of social movement theory offers helpful theoretical insights for the conceptualization of the relationships within the circles of literary journalism and for the framing of the analysis of publishing conditions. Although scholars in the field do not mutually agree, the starting point for the application of Melucci's theory is that the literary journalism of the 1960s, or what has been termed "new journalism", may be understood as a cultural movement.

In his introduction, Weingarten argues that literary journalism was not a movement, but instead a circle of acquainted writers that shared the rule of not really having rules for journalism. He admits that most of the writing he covers emerged during a period of seven years and in this sense it is in fact possible to talk of a movement, but links his negation to the missing definition of the form: “How can you have a movement when no one knows what the movement represents?” (2006: 7). While Wolfe claims that it “was no ‘movement’. There were no manifestos, clubs, salons, cliques; not even a saloon where the faithful gathered, since there was no faith and no creed” (1973: 37), he mentions the feeling of being part of a new development in journalism.

Despite these negating arguments, Melucci’s theory on new social movements is still applicable due to his very fluid and open understanding of the term “movement”. For him, movements are fragile and heterogeneous. They consist of submerged networks that are mostly invisible and only manifest themselves from time to time through visible public action. His editors Keane and Mier find this part of Melucci’s work most original, arguing that these networks are “noted for their stress on individual needs, collective identity and part-time membership” (1989: 6).

Melucci’s work offers itself for three additional reasons. First, because the theory, in spite of its focus on social movements, does not only concentrate on the political terrain and goals, but considers the realm of culture as a key element for understanding contemporary movements.<sup>2</sup> Second, because Melucci’s temporal frame for the emergence of new social movement is similar to that considered in this article. Lastly, because it responds in part to a similar criticism regarding social movements as expressed here with respect to the analysis of literary journalism, namely that “neither the macro-structural models of collective action nor those based on individuals’ motivation are satisfactory, for they lack an understanding of an intermediate level” (1989: 30). The macro-structural models, like the theoretical approach, are too broad to explore the level of personal influence while the anecdotal models, like those theories based on individual motivations, are too detached from theory to formulate claims to a larger context. Melucci’s approach and analytical tools help to establish a middle ground, combining the insights gained from both theoretical and anecdotal sources.

## Why *Esquire*?

The 1960s were a high point of literary journalism. Many of the texts that are now commonly thought of as literary or new journalism appeared during this decade and *Esquire* was one of the most important magazines that provided the narrative style with a platform—from Gay Talese’s profiles to Michael Herr’s Vietnam coverage.

*Esquire* is central for the approach of this article for two reasons: its content offers a great variety of literary journalism covering all the important topics of the decade and its people were at the heart of literary journalism in New York.

Accounts of 1960s literary journalism read like a catalogue of political and historical events that were shaped by and shaping the magazines and still define the 1960s for us today: the youth rebellion and counter-culture, the generation and credibility gap, the civil rights and reforms movements, the assassinations of civil rights leaders, the

radical chic, the sexual revolution, the peaceful demonstrations and violent revolts, and of course the Vietnam War. Still defining the memory, *Esquire* covered all these topics in its very special and unique way from beginning to the end of the decade

The theme issues usually appeared every July and stand as a representative sample of covered topics. Topics ranged from issues on urban life in New York (1960), “The American Woman” (1962), New York’s literary scene (1963) and “sentimentality” (1964), to the coverage of teenagers (1965), “Spying, Science and Sex” (May 1966), violence (1967), coolness (1968), and college life (1969). In addition, *Esquire* writers reflected on key political developments. William Burroughs’ “The Coming of the Purple Better One” (November 1968), or John Sack’s “In A Pig’s Eye” (November 1968) exposed the disturbing clash of civilian and police forces at the height of the peace demonstrations at the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago. Two years earlier, the front page of white letters on black ground with the line “Oh My God, We Hit A Little Girl” shocked the audience when parts of John Sack’s “M” on his Vietnam experiences were published in October 1966. Not to be forgotten as well are the articles trying to make sense out of the assassinations during the 1960s. The 1964 article “Lee Oswald’s Letters to his Mother (with footnotes by Mrs. Oswald)” is as unconventional an attempt as Tom Wicker’s “Kennedy Without Tears” (June 1964). Anthony Howard’s “The Logistics of the Funeral” (November 1968) on Robert Kennedy’s funeral approaches the sensitive topics of death and remembrance in new ways.<sup>3</sup> Traditional reporting, the common argument went, was inadequate to cover the changes because it worked on the basis of providing order but all the times offered was chaos, so the “New Journalists” had to take over becoming “our master explainers, our town criers, even our moral conscience” (Weingarten 2006: 6-7).

Many important texts of literary journalism on 1960s culture appeared first in *Esquire* and many writers associated with the form frequently wrote for the magazine. Norman Mailer and Gay Talese are prominent examples. Norman Mailer’s *Esquire* article “Superman Comes to the Supermarket” (1960) on the presidential candidate Jack Kennedy is often named as one of the first articles of the typical 1960s literary journalism. Mailer also contributed as a columnist under the heading “Big Bite” from 1962-63 filing a combination of fiction and journalism. Weingarten and Polsgrove both make the argument that Talese’s profiles along with Mailer’s 1960s article are an important influence on the 1960s literary journalism. From 1960 on almost all of his pieces, later published in the essay collection “Fame and Obscurity” (1970) were published in *Esquire*. Famous examples include “Joe Louis: The King as a Middle-Aged Man” (1963) or “Frank Sinatra Has a Cold” (1966).

Secondary works like Polsgrove’s and Weingarten’s books have argued before that the *Esquire* texts were an important model of literary journalism. This article attempts to go further and claims that the relationships of writers and editors of the magazine were as important for the development of the form. As a basis for this article, *Esquire* staff and writers are considered as the central network for the movement of literary journalism during the 1960s. Even though literary journalism was published in other magazine outlets as well, most of the writers can be linked to *Esquire*. Former *Esquire* editor Clay Felker, for example, founded the city magazine *New York*, which became another flagship of literary journalism in the late 1960s.

## Alberto Melucci's network theory as theoretical middle ground

Conceptualizing *Esquire* as the center of a movement, made up of a networked creative community promoting the circulation of literary journalism, provides a new theoretical framework for the analysis of the emergence and prominence of the narrative form during that time. The networks of relationships between writers, editors, and publishers as described in Arnold Gingrich's memoir, or in the books by Polsgrove and Weingarten form the textual basis for the application of Melucci's network theory — since after all, as Arnold Gingrich says, “a magazine, in a very real sense, is made of nothing but people” (1971: 4).<sup>4</sup>

Melucci argues that social movements continuously negotiate goals, means and the environment from which they emerge. The same process of negotiation can be applied to an analysis of literary journalism as the product of a social network. Melucci criticizes the concept of social movements as unified entities. Instead, he emphasizes the on-going construction of relationships in a personal and institutional setting: “Collective action is rather the product of purposeful orientations developed within a field of opportunities and constraints. [...] Whatever unity exists should be considered the result and not the starting point, a fact rather to be explained than assumed” (1989: 26). So in Wolfe's words “for the flavor of it, come with me back to the 1960s” (2000: 249) and let me revisit the production of *Esquire's* literary journalism by combining the anecdotal with the institutional “field of opportunities and constraints”. As a starting point this article sketches out this field in its broadest sense by describing opportunities and constraints regarding *Esquire*, then applies the theory to the level of individual actors within their respective fields of action to demonstrate the social construction of the form.

### Esquire's field of opportunities and constraints during the 1960s

The 1960s media environment represented a marked change for *Esquire* from the postwar years, when, according to founding editor Arnold Gingrich editorial quality suffered because “you could sell everything you could print” (1971: 167). Increasing competition in the two markets of content and advertising proved more and more the most important constraint. In the advertising, *Playboy* and *Sports Illustrated*, founded in 1954, enjoyed increasing popularity during the 1960s, and posed an immediate competitive threat in the leisure market aimed at male readers. *Holiday Gentleman's Quarterly*, *True*, and *Argosy* were in the same category catering to a male, leisure-oriented audience. Competitors for content included the city magazine *New York* and the city newspaper *Village Voice*, as well as the established literary magazine *Harper's*, they each increased the competitive situation by publishing articles in the style of the new journalism.<sup>5</sup> By their category as city publications *New York* and *Village Voice* concentrated on an already defined market of urban New Yorkers interested in the happenings of their home town while *Harper's* had always been a magazine with a strong literary profile. Traditionally, *Esquire* had managed to combine service features on leisure and fashion with literary text and now tried to refocus this strategy. The constant challenge of battling literary magazines for quality content but at the same time selling service-orientation to the advertising customers led to a general rethinking of *Esquire's* positioning within the magazine market. From the thirties on, *Esquire's* image had always been that of “the magazine for men” but

aiming at a male readership alone no longer sufficed. Now there were others claiming that same title.

During the process of reshaping between 1952 and 1954 Arnold Gingrich chose to “stir up some excitement by getting talked about with provocative articles” (1971: 198) instead of becoming more service-oriented like *Holiday* or *Playboy*. Harold Hayes became the editor to realize those plans for the next decade. The makeover was more or less accomplished by the 25th anniversary in 1958, to be followed by what Arnold Gingrich calls “the coming of age” (1971: 222), a period in which Harold Hayes finally took over full editorial power in late 1962 and continued his predecessor’s attempt to stay controversial.

The deliberate focus on “provocative” content as the magazine’s marker of difference established an opportunity for the promotion of literary journalism, which typically presented unusual ways of telling a story. For writers and editors it provided the framework of justification against economic pressures because it marked a specific marketable “image”. The “provocative” stories of the sixties did not always fit with the commercial side of the magazine, but the determined editor managed to keep the pages full of them in the light of the argument of marked difference. However, Harold Hayes had to formally present the concept of the next issue to the *Esquire* management and advertisement department from 1963 onward. Meanwhile, further opportunities for the development of this new literary form in this context were created by the tumultuous events of the 1960s. Most of the discussions on controversial pieces could not hold against the fast-paced events needing coverage right away. Compromises between editorial and advertising were constantly necessary, so Harold Hayes printed fashion spreads to please the advertisers and thereby “still left far more pages to devote to other things than most magazines would have in the years to come” (Polsgrove 1995: 72) and in so doing helped to create a platform for the literary journalists.

*Esquire*’s issues were constantly crossing the fine line between upsetting advertising clients and pleasing the readers with explosive material, and some of *Esquire*’s competitors were not as daring. The example of a story by Hunter S. Thompson demonstrates the influence advertising had on limiting the form. *Playboy*, for example, did not publish Thompson’s story on the skier Jean-Claude Killy, because it was too hot a topic and too controversial in its language describing how cultural icons like Killy were used as selling machines for the big companies. *Playboy* did not want to lose an ad deal with one of its biggest clients, Chevrolet. For Harold Hayes a turn towards service features was not the answer to the economic pressures. Literary journalism, even though not always the most unproblematic form of writing, would remain a marker of the magazine attracting readership and thereby precious advertising customers.

At the same time, television added a whole new layer of economic threat for audience and advertising sales. Polsgrove mentions that there was no way to “hope to keep up with television’s soaring numbers [...], especially after *Esquire* abandoned the girlie market to *Playboy*” (1995: 26). From the end of WW II on, more and more stations had been licensed by the Federal Communications Commission the licenses reached an apex during this decade creating an additional motivation for increased differentiation via a concentration on an intellectual literary profile in combination with leisure and fashion features.

*Esquire's* part in the literary production process and the making of authors within the publishing industry of the 1960s can be viewed as another positive factor for the increasing presence of literary journalism. The publishing industry – defined as magazine and book publishers – for over 100 years jointly created authors, equally benefiting writers, publishers, and magazine content.<sup>6</sup> For the writers book publication offered alternative income.<sup>7</sup> The book publishing industry took their share by providing ideas and suggesting books in progress. For them the magazine offered the space to advertise upcoming books by publishing select chapters, drawing the attention of interested readers. Such joint efforts in the making of authors led to a stronger presence of literary journalism in *Esquire*, because literary writers would join traditional journalists in reporting instead of exclusively contributing fiction. Harold Hayes gave them the space to let their creativity and sensibility flow while covering pressing topics of the day.

The long lead-time for magazines has to be considered as another important factor in explaining the type of stories and the style of writing as part of the process of collaboration between editors and authors.<sup>8</sup> Since the lead-time for magazines can amount to as much as three months, topics of national importance such as President Kennedy's assassination could not be covered right away. However, in transforming this circumstance into an opportunity, Harold Hayes managed to find new angles by using the writers' individual creativity on topics that would be out-dated in the traditional press. At the same time, this long lead-time was yet another factor in attracting writers to journalism in the first place. Weingarten argues that Michael Herr intended from the start to produce work which required intensive and long-time research only possible because of the long lead-time of magazines. These two reactions to the traditional disadvantage of a long lead-time therefore joined together in the pages of *Esquire* cleverly exploited by the actors on both sides of the magazine's creative process.

An analysis of *Esquire's* opportunities and constraints would not be complete without looking at the cultural developments of the 1960s in relation to audience and topics. The opportunity to specialize in content and style instead of service orientation became more valuable in the context of catering to an audience of men whose generation had been educated under the GI bill and who were looking for a different gratification from the pages of the magazine than what they could get from TV. In his introduction to the *Esquire* anthology, Harold Hayes describes life during the 1950s as “monotonously predictable” for the average American—“a second car and a swimming pool were facts of his life, a new vacation home an immediate possibility” (1969: xviii). The sixties implied a sudden shift from the conservative fifties, when “the challenge had been to break up the ice of fifties culture” (Polsgrove 1995: 122). The GI Bill caused part of the sudden change by offering a college education to the many men returning from war. *Esquire's* new audience became the GI Bill crowd—“an audience that cared about rock and roll and the spiritual position of modern man, an audience that had heard of French playwrights and existentialists, an educated audience weary of television” (Polsgrove 1995: 39). It might be quite a leap from the GI Bill to existentialism but the increased interest in the humanities is expressed here through a placeholder signifying intellectual and cultural practices such as jazz, beat literature or countercultural activities. This change reflected back on the magazine's editorial coverage, because it meant a new approach to topics and style, in such a way as to appeal to an increasingly more youthful audience. Arnold

Gingrich officially stepped back from editorial business in 1961 because he saw that it was time to entrust the magazine to those more familiar with this new field. Most of the decisions were already being made with the help of a group of young editors gradually taking over the steering wheel from the late 1950s. Arnold Gingrich says that during the sixties the readership's median age "dropped a year per year, coming down to thirty-three from forty, the figure around which it had always hovered from the beginning" (1971: 211). The median age of the new staff would start to match that of the new audience.

While a lot of these arguments – expanding younger market, the creation of authors, the long lead time – apply to any magazine of the era, they are presented here to define and describe the field in which the *Esquire* network acted and reacted.

### The Esquire network within the field

According to Polsgrove, the resulting new *Esquire* has to be understood as a group project with a great editor, whose talent was to bring out the best in others: "And so this is the story not only of Harold Hayes, but of all who made *Esquire* in the sixties one of the most intricate records of its time" (1995: 13). For the journalist, the editor is first and foremost the person who creates and shapes what Melucci describes as "the field of opportunities and constraints" for collective action. Harold Hayes might not have asked writers to practice literary journalism but he created an environment in which this was possible. Within the network, the editor became the central figure, creating opportunities and reducing constraints for the individual writer.

Within this part of the analysis it is interesting to look a little closer at the figure of the editor, who takes personal risks with writers despite economic pressures because he believes in their talent. *Esquire's* editor Harold Hayes is often described as completely trustful and supportive. The publication of Michael Herr's story "Hell Sucks" on the 1967 TET offensive in Vietnam can be viewed as exemplary of this unique editor-writer relationship. Herr had used reconstruction and an almost "made-up ending" but in the end Harold Hayes took the story. Harold Hayes was taking the risk only based on his trust for Herr during a time "when the magazine's best nonfiction writers were pushing their reportage into murky territory where creative interpretation mingled with straight documentation" (Weingarten 2006: 168). Here Melucci is helpful again. In order to explain the motivation behind an individual actor, he argues for a combination of personal reasons and an understanding of resources available: Harold Hayes actions are contextualized in the magazine's economic and cultural conditions. Harold Hayes gave writers the freedom to pursue the form that questions the standards of traditional news in space, approach, time and style. Because he understood or sensed the importance of the form for the overall concept of the magazine he undertook immense efforts to support his journalists—"writing letters, making calls, clearing the way, as if the *Esquire* office were a supportive unit for soldiers in battle" (1995: 136). He fought with the management and advertisement department over stories, supported book projects and had a sense of the right match in assignments. Arnold Gingrich describes how "he seemed to have a rationale for everything he wanted to do in terms of how it related to the concept of the entire magazine" and how he also had a feeling for the general trends, "for the mood changes that were beginning to develop across the country,

and particularly among the young, in the late 1950s, and he was good at working up features that appealed” (1971: 210).

A concrete episode of *Esquire* history might illustrate what Melucci understands as collective action emerging out of a “field of opportunities and constraints” (1989: 26) leading to the creation of great literary journalism. In the context of the process of reshaping *Esquire*, Arnold Gingrich hired younger staff such as art director Henry Wolf, literary editor Rust Hills, and editors Harold Hayes, Clay Felker, and Ralph Ginzburg, with the last three in competition for the managing editor’s position. Even though Arnold Gingrich recounts that for him it soon became clear that Harold Hayes would be his choice for successor, Weingarten paints the picture differently, describing constant power struggles between the three young editors.<sup>9</sup> Arnold Gingrich recounts that “the young Turks” gathered every Friday for editorial meetings. The joke in the office was that it gave them time until Monday to wash the blood off the walls. These editors would fiercely compete for the best ideas and form flexible alliances in supporting and opposing each other. Within this field of force “the issues of the magazine were beginning to be as lively as the meeting that engendered their content” (Gingrich 1971: 206). During this experimental period one creative, controversial, crazy idea beat the next. The structural changes brought on by targeting a younger more intellectual audience manifested themselves here as the field of force for the competition between the team of young editors. Arnold Gingrich, at this time still managing editor, was himself but one actor affected by the larger forces of increased economic competition and accelerated cultural change typical of the 1960s. Still he used these forces productively by instilling a system of competition within the magazine, which influenced the variety and creativity of its content.

This example can also be used to explain Melucci’s analytical tool “collective identity,” which he defines as “an interactive and shared definition produced by several interacting individuals who are concerned with the orientations of their action as well as the field of opportunities and constraints in which their action takes place” (1989: 34). In the given example the actors do not intentionally work on defining themselves in relation to literary journalism but by letting their creativities run free and constantly renewing their approaches toward covering the topics of the day, they were creating the phenomenon collectively. In Melucci’s account the emotional and subjective accounts and investments play an important role in addition to constraints and prospects.<sup>10</sup> It can prove productive for researchers to pay close attention to the choice of words in trying to interpret and explain the emotional component of “collective identity”. The common office joke of washing the blood off the walls thus becomes an indicator of the personal importance attached by the individual actors towards their common goal. Another example of emotional investment is evident in the way Wolfe mentions a particular feeling of belonging in his 1973 introduction. He apparently sensed an affiliation to a certain group of people who were doing things differently.<sup>11</sup> He points out that the new journalism was no movement, but admits having been aware of “some sort of artistic excitement in journalism” (1973: 37). He also confesses knowing “what certain writers were doing at *Esquire*” and “checking out all these people to see what new spins they had come up with” (37).

Wolfe’s comment articulates an awareness of the network. New York as the epicenter of literary journalism offers perfect ground for the analysis of social networks.

The literary power chart for the *Esquire* issue on writing in the winter of 1962-63 demonstrates visually one version of literary relationships. Rust Hill had produced a chart of the city's most important agents, book reviewers, magazines, book publishers and academic critics. It would be interesting to attempt to sketch a similar chart for the network of literary journalism in New York. But no chart reveals the emotional investment or what has been going on behind the scenes. In places like *Elaine's*, a traditional gathering for literary circles, or at the many *Esquire* gatherings and parties, literary journalist, writers and editors of different magazines mingled and exchanged ideas. One can only imagine the sense of belonging to this network in which creative ideas fluctuated. This article can only be a starting point for tracing those various connections and influences as they are relayed in the memoirs, interviews and texts of the time.

---

## Conclusion

Based on the assumption that literary journalism can be understood as a movement, this article employs Alberto Melucci's network theory of social movements as theoretical middle ground for the combination of evidence from theoretical and anecdotal sources. Literary journalism is theorized as the product of a social network within an economic and cultural "field of opportunities and constraints" (1989: 26). The analysis attempts to sketch *Esquire's* "field" for the 1960s on the level of the magazine as a whole as well as for the individual actors within it.

Melucci's theory frames the analysis of the creative *Esquire* community as a constantly created network in an everyday setting of office life, cocktail parties and friendships and highlights the emotional and anecdotal evidence available. Melucci says that traditionally collective action is only observed as "the visible face of mobilization" and therefore researchers overlook "that collective action is nourished by the daily production of alternative frameworks of meaning, on which the networks themselves are founded and live from day to day" (1989: 70-71). The same argument could be applied to the literary journalism of the 1960s as forms of cultural production. Most of the discussions in secondary sources draw on Wolfe's definition of the "New Journalism" in his 1973 anthology although looking at his career and position within the network of writers and editors during the previous ten year might be at least as insightful.

Ultimately, this paper's proposal should help teach literary journalism as something that needs to be understood in relation to its conditions of production. Literary journalism as a form that changes in social networks invites students to create the genre afresh in accord with the conditions and communities of their own time. It would also take away the grounds for the common excuse that the times are just not as provocative anymore. Polsgrove says: "The times may be what great editors make of them" (1995: 286), and as should be clear by now, not editors or writers alone.

## Notes

- 1 The criticism of both approaches is based on a survey of selected anthologies, introductory works and memoirs in the field of literary journalism. Besides the already referred book by Kerrane and Yagoda, the attempt to write a comprehensive theory or history can be found in Hartsock's *History of American Literary Journalism* (2000), in Connery's introduction to *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism* (1992), in both Kramer and Sims' introductions to *Literary Journalism: A New Collection of Best American Nonfiction* (1995), and in Boynton's introduction to *The New New Journalism* (2005). The memoirs of Arnold Gingrich, Willie Morris as well as the books by Weingarten, Polsgrove and Kunkel are examples of the anecdotal
- 2 Steven M. Buechler's (1995) proposes a typology in which Alberto Melucci's approach represents the cultural version. See his article for an extended discussion on the utility of new social movement theories.
- 3 All the text mentioned here are taken from Harold Hayes' *Esquire* anthology of the 1960s, but are cited with the respective time of their publication in *Esquire*.
- 4 The textual basis for this work may be anecdotal—unfortunately other sources are hardly available—but ties in with a survey of the magazine's content and put into context of verifiable dates, facts and evidence of publishing conditions from the secondary sources.
- 5 *New York* started as a Sunday supplement to the Herald Tribune in 1963. When the newspaper folded due to financial trouble, editor Clay Felker and designer Milton Glaser took over the supplement and turned it into a magazine in 1968. *Rolling Stone* is not considered here, because it was only founded in the late 1960s (1968).
- 6 This is based on the argument of an unpublished, forthcoming article by Carol Polsgrove for the post-World War II volume of *A History of the Book in America*.
- 7 *Esquire*'s pay and that of similar magazines, excluding *The New Yorker*, did not compete with the compensation by national newspapers or TV, while Harold Hayes is described as demanding. In the end, the turnout in fees did not always cover the amount of work. "So *Esquire* writers were happy to turn their *Esquire* work into books, and publishers would read *Esquire* to find nascent books" (Polsgrove 1995: 168).
- 8 *Esquire* writer Gary Wills "thought later, that lead time had more to do than anything else with the development of what was called 'New Journalism'. The challenge of living in two levels of time—the present in which he was reporting and the future when the piece would appear—produced an intense state of mind" (Polsgrove 1995: 168).
- 9 Gingrich writes in his memoir: "I don't know whether he'd been there a week or a month when I came to the conclusion that he was there for good, and that whoever else came or went, this was the one guy I wanted to be sure would be there when I no longer could be" (1971: 204).
- 10 "Considered as a process, collective identity involves at least three fundamental dimensions which are in reality closely interwoven: first, formulating cognitive frameworks concerning the goals, means and environment of action; second, activating relationships among the actors, who communicate, negotiate, and make decisions; and third, making emotional investments, which enable individuals to recognize themselves in each other" (1989: 35).
- 11 "I had the feeling, rightly or wrongly, that I was doing things no one had ever done before in journalism. I had no sense of being a part of any normal journalistic or literary environment [...] I'm sure that others who were experimenting with magazine articles, such as Talese, began to feel the same way" (Wolfe 1973, 34).

## References

- Boynton, Robert S. (2005). *The New New Journalism: Conversations With America's Best Nonfiction Writers On Their Craft*. Vintage Books, New York.
- Buechler, Steven M. (1995). New Social Movement Theories, *Sociology Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 3, Summer: 441-464.
- Connery, Thomas B. (1992). *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism*. Greenwood Press, New York.
- Gingrich, Arnold (1971). *Nothing But People. The Early Days at Esquire, a Personal History, 1928-1958*, Crown, New York.
- Hartsock, John C. (2000). *A History of American Literary Journalism*. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.
- Hayes, Harold (1969). *Smiling Through the Apocalypse; Esquire's History of the Sixties*, McCall Pub. Co., New York.
- Kerrane, Kevin and Ben Yagoda (1995). *The Art of Fact*, Scribner, New York.
- Melucci, Alberto (1989). *Nomads of the Present*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Kunkel, Thomas (1995). *Genius in Disguise: Harold Ross of the New Yorker*. Random House, New York.
- Mailer, Norman. "Superman Comes to the Supermarket." *Esquire* (November 1960): 119-27.
- Morris, Willie (1993). *New York Days*. Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
- Polsgrove, Carol (1995). *It Wasn't Pretty, Folks, But Didn't We Have Fun? Esquire in the Sixties*, Norton & Company, New York.
- Sims, Norman, and Mark Kramer (1995). *Literary Journalism: a New Collection of the Best American Nonfiction*. Ballantine Books, New York.
- Talese, Gay. *Fame and Obscurity*. New York: Laurel, 1986.
- Weingarten, Marc (2006). *The Gang That Wouldn't Write Straight: Wolfe, Thompson, Didion, and the New Journalism Revolution*, Crown Publishers, New York.

---

Anja Zinke is a graduate student with a double major in American Studies and Communication Science studying at the Freie Universität Berlin, Germany, interested in all manifestations of the interactions between communication and culture. The idea for this article developed as thesis preparation with Prof. Carol Polsgrove of the journalism department during my year abroad at Indiana University, Bloomington, USA, in 2006.