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Abstract

Thomas B. Connery states that ‘Although much has been written about a type of writing that contains elements of journalism and fiction, consensus has not emerged as to what to call it or how to define it.’ This thesis addresses this issue by proposing a broad theoretical framework and approach for defining and analysing a wide variety of books in the genre, using David L. Eason’s typology of realist literary journalism (RLJ) and modernist literary journalism (MLJ). This is the first time that Eason’s theory has been applied in close readings of literary journalism texts.

Rather than being two distinct subgenres, Eason’s categories of RLJ and MLJ are two ‘modes’ of responding to and organising the experience of reporting, which narrate highly personalised, interpretive and evocative accounts of reality. However, due to the widely differing aesthetic styles and approaches found in this genre, these categories have been refined and supplemented using Joseph M. Webb’s theory of rationalism and romanticism in journalism. This thesis combines Eason and Webb’s theories to create a spectrum—ranging from ‘objective’ to ‘subjective’—in order to locate the six primary texts analysed in this thesis, depending on how influenced they are by either rationalism or romanticism. This is another original contribution made by this thesis.

Norman Sims argues that many literary journalism theorists and critics have based their scholarship of the genre on literary criticism and theory, and warns that ‘We must be careful that our scholarship does not mimic that of one sector of the

---

Abstract

Although the interpretive methodology used in this thesis is textual analysis, this thesis makes use of Anabela Carvalho’s critical discourse analysis, developed for close readings of media texts, because it offers strategies to ensure the factual referentiality of the six primary texts is respected, and the analyses are informed by key contextual factors. Also, the close readings draw heavily from the interdisciplinary subfield of narratology, so Risto Kunelius’ narrative perspective on journalistic discourse is adopted in order to provide a focused and systematic approach to the narratological analysis of the six primary texts.

Literary journalism is an evolving genre that resists narrow definitions. Accordingly, the methodology applied in this thesis is flexible and broad so that it can be applied to virtually any text in this genre, yet still be a useful tool for analysing the unique characteristics of each text in detail. The innovate combination of Eason’s typology as refined by Webb, with the reading practices of Carvalho and Kunelius offers an original, inclusive and flexible means to explore the in many ways still uncharted territory of literary journalism.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Character-bound Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>Close Third Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Distant Observation of a Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>External Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
<td>Free Indirect Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Implied Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLJ</td>
<td>Modernist Literary Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLJ</td>
<td>Realist Literary Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Textual Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; PP</td>
<td>First-Person Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; PP</td>
<td>Second-Person Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; PP</td>
<td>Third-Person Perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

Literary journalism, according to Nancy L. Roberts, ‘aims to be factual while using the techniques commonly associated with literary writing, particularly literary fiction—all in the service of illuminating a larger or “literary” truth about human existence.’⁴ Although there are differing claims about the origins of literary journalism, Iona Italia traces it to periodical writing in the 18th century. She observes that the major features of the genre ‘were influenced by the desires of periodical writers to shake off journalism’s disreputable image…[by]…securing a measure of literary respectability…’⁵ and that writers set out to achieve this by introducing the language and plots of the sentimental novel.⁶ Around the same time, realist novelists such as Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding and Tobias Smollett were writing stories that claimed to be factual, which produced in their readers ‘a characteristic uncertainty or ambivalence as to whether they were reading something true or false.’⁷ Lennard J. Davis explains how, as a result of this confusion, new genres such as history, journalism and fiction were created so that the public could identify what sort of narrative they were reading.⁸

As John C. Hartsock notes, in its early stages literary journalism defied definitive identification with any particular generic category and subsequently became critically marginalised because it constitutes a dynamic narrative process working across a narrative spectrum, with one end merging with conventional journalism and

---

⁸ Davis, Factual Fictions, 37.
‘the other merging into solipsistic memoir and overt fiction.’ 9 Two major developments in journalism and literature at the end of the 19th century compounded this issue, effectively ensuring that the genre would be widely disregarded as either serious journalism or serious literature.10 Firstly, by the 1880s ‘objectivity’ had become the central norm of the journalistic profession in America.11 Literary journalism’s tendency to personalise events and issues, and dramatise situations using scene setting and character building, violated this objective ideal,12 placing it in opposition to conventional notions of journalism. Secondly, as Phyllis Frus argues, during this period, literature began to be conceived as a collection of timeless works of universal value in order to exclude journalism and other forms of factual narratives.13 With the journalism and mass communication academy ‘reifying the concept of objectivity at the expense of subjectivity...’ 14 and the literary establishment creating a concept of literature that excluded nonfiction writing, literary journalism was simultaneously marginalised by both journalism and literature.

The genre’s persistent identity problems are exposed by the plethora of terms currently used to denote nonfiction narrative, such as literary journalism, literary nonfiction, creative nonfiction, new journalism and the nonfiction novel.15 According to Ronald Weber, ‘this category of serious writing is not well defined, and the many

---

15 As Robert L. Root Jr. has noted, there is an issue from the outset ‘simply naming nonfiction as a class of written works.’ “Naming Nonfiction,” College English, vol. 65, no. 3 (January 2003), 242. For the purposes of clarity, the terms ‘literary journalism’ and ‘nonfiction narrative’ will be used in this thesis to refer to the genre and the type of discourse, respectively.
terms used to describe it...have done nothing to clarify matters.'

Hartsock goes even further to argue that uncertainty over what to call this genre is not just an identity problem: it is indicative of a ‘large critical void of which the problem of identity is symptomatic of a larger generic problem: how to contextualize a body of writing that, to provide a working definition, reads like a novel or short story except that it is true or makes a truth claim to reflecting phenomenal experience.’

This thesis contends that for over forty years the polarisation of the critical debate concerning literary journalism has been exemplified by Tom Wolfe and Mas’ud Zavarzadeh’s mutually exclusive definitions, which have inhibited the theoretical development of criticism relating to the genre. Wolfe partially succeeded in establishing an identifiable school of writing, defining New Journalism as a form that utilises the techniques of social realism, which Géraldine Mulmann says reflects Wolfe’s hostility towards purely subjective nonfictional writing. The neglect of overtly subjective forms of nonfiction writing in Wolfe’s definition of New Journalism encouraged Zavarzadeh to create a competing theory of ‘nonfiction novels’, which he defines as being coloured by the writer’s personal history and outlook and lacking in any interpretative commentary because they are a direct inscription of sensory data, and therefore resist the developmental narrative structure of a plot-based story. However, echoing Wolfe’s theory of New Journalism, Thomas

---

17 John C. Hartsock, ‘“Literary Journalism” as an Epistemological Moving Object within a Larger “Quantum” Narrative,’ *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, vol. 23, no. 4 (October 1999), 432.
20 Throughout this thesis, the terms ‘writer’, ‘reporter’, and ‘journalist’ are used interchangeably to refer to the creator of the nonfiction narrative. However, ‘author’ is avoided because of its connection to fiction writing.
B. Connery explains that Zavarzadeh’s conception of nonfiction novels can only be ‘applied to some of the works of literary journalism, but not to all.’

Literary journalism currently lacks a fixed working definition and normative terminology partly because it is an innovative genre that is still developing and resisting narrow definitions. Whilst scholars may have formulated generic definitions of literary journalism, no theory will ever be complete or methodologically adequate until finer distinctions are made between several subcategories of texts. As Barbara Foley explains, this genre will continue to elude theorists until they have set up ‘guideposts for venturing into this terrain and have proposed charts to delineate the broad configurations of the important zones of inquiry; but…thus far, the rich interior is still unexplored.’

The aim of this thesis is to put forward an inclusive and flexible means to explore literary journalism’s rich interior by creating a broad theoretical framework and approach that is suitable for defining and analysing any given text in this genre. An original contribution of this thesis is to apply David L. Eason’s typology of realist literary journalism (RLJ) and modernist literary journalism (MLJ) in the textual analysis of nonfiction narrative. Another original contribution of the thesis is to combine Eason’s typology with Joseph M. Webb’s theory of rationalism and romanticism to create a spectrum ranging from ‘objective’ to ‘subjective’ in which virtually any work of literary journalism can be located.

21 Connery, “Discovering a Literary Form,” 23.
23 Barbara Foley, “Fact, Fiction, and “Reality”,” Contemporary Literature, vol. 20, no. 3 (Summer 1979), 399.
24 Eason first distinguished two modes of ‘New Journalism’ (entitled ‘ethnographic realism’ and ‘cultural phenomenology’) in a journal article published in 1990. He later refers to these modes as RLJ and MLJ in a chapter he wrote on the same subject for Norman Sims anthology, Literary Journalism in the Twentieth Century. RLJ and MLJ are the terms used in this thesis, despite citing the original journal article throughout.
Eason’s typology provides the basic model for dividing the genre into two subcategories of texts. RLJ includes texts that have an omniscient narrator and utilise literary techniques associated with social realism while MLJ is associated with reflective, exploratory and essentially personal forms of literary journalism. Together, they account for the two main forms of writing found in this genre. Eason is by no means the first theorist to identify two kinds of writing within the larger category of literary journalism; however, he is one of the few theorists to have incorporated these two types of writing within a single theory, thereby offering an alternative to the more limited generic definitions. Despite RLJ’s neutral, objective presentation style, this thesis contends that RLJ is a postmodern form of factual writing, and does not, as Eason claims, reflect ‘faith in the capability of traditional models of interpretation and expression, particularly the story form, to reveal the real.’ Accordingly, another aim of this thesis is to reconcile RLJ with the subjective ideal of literary journalism, alongside MLJ.

This thesis does not offer an exhaustive study of the entire landscape of literary journalism; instead, it conducts a series of close textual analyses of six primary texts displaying the qualities and techniques relevant to Eason’s typology, which at the same time represent the range of nonfiction narrative found in the genre. These primary texts are divided equally between RLJ and MLJ so that both modes receive equal critical attention. As Norman Sims explains, literary journalism ‘can be seen as part of a broader sensibility toward telling stories in journalism, or simply a


narrative impulse.’ Accordingly, the research emphasises narrative, with the comparative and interdisciplinary sub-field of narratology acting as the main resource for the close readings. As narratology is replete with specialist terminology primarily associated with fiction, care is taken to respect the factual referentiality of the texts examined in this thesis by using Anabela Carvalho’s critical discourse analysis methodology, which provides a set of research strategies that ensure that key contextual factors are considered in conjunction to the close readings.

Norman K. Denzin writes that narrative journalism tends to be ‘judged by aesthetic criteria, how well the story coheres, and so on.” The approach taken in this thesis, however, has a different emphasis. One intended outcome of the study is to create a way of analysing nonfiction narrative that takes into consideration the writer’s claims to facticity and the external reality to which the narrative refers. In the world of journalism—and literary journalism is no exception—‘accuracy reigns as the supreme clause in the symbolic contract with readers….’ It is not sufficient to focus purely on the literary aspects of these reports because literary journalism is a factual form of writing that has empirical value as news. Accordingly, the primary texts are studied using aesthetic criteria and evaluated on epistemological grounds.

Another intended outcome of the thesis is to reinvigorate the debate over how to define a form that crosses the boundaries of journalism and literature. Phillip Smallwood stated that ‘it is impossible to define literary journalism by its intrinsic attributes alone.’ I hope that by the end of this thesis it will be clear that literary

---

29 Sims, True Stories, 6.
journalism can indeed be defined by its intrinsic attributes, and that there is no reason why it should remain the ‘great unexplored territory of contemporary criticism…’

This thesis consists of nine substantive chapters—in addition to the introduction and conclusion—and is split into three parts. PART I: The Foundation Section consists of three chapters (Chapters 2, 3 and 4). The Literature Review (Ch. 2) situates the current study within the related literature and covers the body of critical and theoretical scholarship on nonfiction narrative that has appeared since the advent of New Journalism. It exposes the two fundamental notions of literary journalism that have created a schism in academic theory and that have led to the lack of a fixed working definition and normative terminology for the genre. The Theoretical Framework & Approach (Ch. 3) conducts a critical review of Eason’s typology in relation to the historical context of literary journalism and current practice. It makes a case for the need to re-define RLJ as part of the same subjective ideal of literary journalism as MLJ, since both modes respond to and organise the experience of reporting in a highly personalised, interpretive and evocative manner. As James E. Kinneavy argues, discourses exist along a continuum with variable referential and emotive affirmations—pure reference is scientific; pure emotion is poetic. Literary journalism is more poetic than scientific despite RLJ’s style and tone; and in order to reflect this, Webb’s theory of rationalism and romanticism in journalism is used to create a spectrum that suitably locates the six primary texts analysed in the thesis according to their respective referential and emotive affirmations. The Method (Ch. 4) outlines Anabela Carvalho’s methodological framework for analysing journalistic

---

discourse and Risto Kunelius’ model for analysing narrative voice, and establishes how these two theories will be applied in the close readings.

In PART II, three works of RLJ are analysed, namely: David Simon’s *Homicide* (Ch. 5), Thomas Keneally’s *Schindler’s Ark* (Ch. 6) and The *Art of Political Murder* by Francisco Goldman (Ch. 7). Chapter 5 analyses the different literary devices that Simon uses in *Homicide*, illustrating how RLJ tries to close the epistemological gap between the reader and the hypothetically objectified world. Chapter 6 explores Keneally’s metaphorical interpretation of Oskar Schindler’s life and conduct during World War II and reveals how the method of RLJ helps to make this interpretation appear ‘natural’. Chapter 7 applies Bakhtin’s concept of the literary chronotope in examining how Goldman manipulates the presentation of the spatial environment depicted in the narrative so as to contribute to the rhetorical intentions of the text.

PART III analyses three MLJ texts: *The First Stone* by Helen Garner (Ch. 8), *The Whore of Akron* by Scott Raab (Ch. 9) and *Riding Toward Everywhere* by William T. Vollmann (Ch. 10). Chapter 8 examines the ethical dilemmas of Garner’s self-reflexive approach when investigating an alleged sexual assault at Melbourne University, and reveals that Garner never considers the moral justification of her actions as a journalist, which restricts her from exploring the reality that actors and spectators create in their interaction or from taking responsibility for her role as an observer, which in MLJ, is considered to be grounded in an epistemology and an ethics. Chapter 9 studies the narrative techniques Raab uses to depict his psychological torment resulting from his decision to present the narrative from his

---

perspective as a basketball fan, instead of from his professional perspective as a reporter. It shows that by presenting the narrative from his own point of view as a fan, Raab is able to subject his observations to interpretative analysis and consider the ethical dilemmas implicit in creating worlds for anonymous readers.\textsuperscript{35} Chapter 10 shows how Vollmann exposes through his writing the way in which narrative both constructs and reveals the ‘real’ and considers the implications of this for the nature of narrative communication and the narrative subject in literary journalism. Finally, the Conclusion (Ch. 11) reiterates the main points of the study, and suggests opportunities for further research.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
PART I
THE FOUNDATIONAL SECTION
Literature Review

According to John C. Hartsock, literary journalism has been considered more seriously by academicians since the emergence of New Journalism in the United States (U.S.) in the ’60s and ’70s but he writes that ‘the attention focused on the form, given its widespread practice, remains relatively modest.’ 36 Literary journalism scholarship has traditionally concentrated on high-profile writers associated with New Journalism, such as Hunter S. Thompson, Norman Mailer, Joan Didion, Tom Wolfe, Truman Capote and Gay Talese. Tom Wolfe claimed that New Journalism set a precedent because it was journalism that ‘read like a novel…’ 37 Yet, Edd Applegate states that the New Journalists were unoriginal in their style and practice, and exploited techniques that had been used in literary journalism for several hundred years. 38 Marc Weingarten disputes this claim, contending that New Journalism’s iconic texts, such as Tom Wolfe’s The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test, Joan Didion’s Slouching Towards Bethlehem and Michael Herr’s Dispatches, were revolutionary because they ‘changed the way readers viewed the world.’ 39 These texts were nonconformist and experimental, offering highly subjective visions of reality that accommodated radical incomprehension, which was a symptom of the kaleidoscopic socio-political changes taking place at the time. Irrespective of whether the techniques of these writers were original or not, Weingarten points out that New Journalism

marked an unprecedented outpouring of creative nonfiction, and is therefore a natural starting point for the analysis of this genre in its modern form.

New Journalism could be said to have started as a genre in 1973, when Tom Wolfe published his three-part essay, “The New Journalism,” which provided a vocabulary for the various methods and techniques that were being used by a disparate group of nonfiction narrative writers at that time. This essay was also an affirmation and defence of a type of reporting that refused to acquiesce with conventional standards of journalistic objectivity, such as detachment, non-partisanship, balance, reliance on facts and the inverted pyramid article structure. Jack Newfield, an early supporter of New Journalism, proposes that the New Journalists were driven by an ideological desire to challenge ‘the central myth of objectivity.’ Wolfe’s critique of the newspaper industry and literary establishment in his essay were seen to be emblematic of this rebelliousness.

Many theorists and commentators regard New Journalism as a rebellious and perhaps even a revolutionary movement in journalism in the 20th century. John J. Pauly, for instance, says that these writers were responsible for transforming ‘not just the styles of nonfiction writing, but the very institutions through which society produced and consumed stories about itself.’ Phyllis Frus argues that part of their

---

41 This Literature Review is not an exhaustive study of literary journalism history and theory but rather an analysis of many of the major works that relate to the two discrete classes of writing that David Eason identifies in his journal article: ‘The New Journalism and the Image-World: Two Modes of Organizing Experience’.
success was due to the ‘counterpractices’\textsuperscript{46} that they conducted—strategies that critique the dominant practice of journalism and offer alternatives. According to Frus, counterpractices are the characteristic mechanisms ‘of a countercultural, radical, or oppositional “low” form...’ that was concurrently marginalised and co-opted because ‘many of its manifestations turn out to be “symbolically central” but “socially peripheral”...’\textsuperscript{47} To clarify her point, Frus uses the example of young men growing long hair at the height of the Vietnam war to illustrate how socially peripheral cultural practices have the potential to make symbolically central social and political statements.

Wolfe, aware of the popular appeal of countercultural, radical and oppositional ‘low’ forms in the U.S. at that time, provocatively presents the New Journalists as outcasts vying for a position at the top of the literary establishment. He describes the New Journalists as ‘lumpenproles’ (38)—in reference to ‘Lumpenproletariat’, a term that Peter Stallybrass attributes to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, that was used in \textit{The Communist Manifesto} to refer to ‘the dangerous class’ and ‘the mob’. Stallybrass explains that this term was later redefined as a metaphor for the reign of Louise Phillipe and the collapse of the July Monarchy, in which ‘the low has become high and, in the rhetoric of Marx, the high is brought low again.’\textsuperscript{48} Wolfe was convinced that contemporary novelists, who were commonly regarded as representing the pinnacle of the literary hierarchy, were losing their cultural relevancy and appeal because they were not keeping abreast of the radical social and political changes in America at the time. Novelists had lost faith in their ability to capture and define the \textit{zeitgeist} and consequently ‘abandoned the richest

\textsuperscript{46} Frus, \textit{The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative}, 122.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Peter Stallybrass, “Marx and Heterogeneity: Thinking Lumpenproletariat,” \textit{Representations}, no. 31, Special Issue: The Margins of Identity in Nineteenth-Century England (Summer 1990), 86.
terrain of the novel; namely, society, the social tableau, manners and morals, the whole business of ‘the way we live now,’…’ (43-4). Wolfe considered this to be a mistake because he felt that the ’60s and ’70s would not be remembered as ‘the decade of the war in Vietnam or of the space exploration or of political assassination…[but]…the decade when manners and morals, styles of living, attitudes towards the world changed the country more crucially than any political events…” (44). These dramatic social and cultural changes played right into the hands of the New Journalists, according to Wolfe, offering them a crucial advantage over the novelists because their elaborate and painstaking reportorial methods offered them the access and exposure needed to familiarise themselves and understand the many different groups that were emerging within America’s increasingly multifarious social landscape.

Wolfe explains that New Journalists would typically devote months, and sometimes years to a single story, immersing themselves in their subjects’ lives for prolonged periods of time. By pushing the boundaries of journalistic practice in this way, Wolfe insists that these writers were able to acquire a comprehensive epistemological understanding of their subjects and subject matter, which legitimised their use of literary techniques and set them apart—journalistically—from their peers. However, Robert S. Boynton says that Wolfe did not want New Journalism to be regarded merely as the next logical stage in journalism; he wanted to break away from journalism in order to prove its literary pedigree.49 Wolfe set about trying to achieve this by defining New Journalism as an autochthonous literary form that revived the art of social realism by extending the techniques of 19th century realistic fiction to the

Wolfe believed that by dismissing social realism as ‘old hat’ (57), contemporary American novelists had abandoned the source of their literary power and efficacy, which he likens to an ‘engineer who decides to give up electricity because it has ‘been done’.’ (57). In contrast, the New Journalists were embracing and experimenting with ‘the devices that gave the realist novel its unique power…its ‘immediacy,’ its ‘concrete reality,’ its emotional involvement,’ its ‘gripping’ or ‘absorbing’ quality.’ (46).

Wolfe identifies four main social realist devices that were being utilised by the New Journalists, namely: scene-by-scene construction (‘telling the story by moving from scene to scene and resorting as little as possible to sheer history narrative…’ (46)); recording dialogue in full (which, according to Wolfe, ‘establishes and defines character more quickly and effectively than any other single device…’ (46)); third-person point of view (allowing the narrator to present multiple perspectives by switching between them under the guise of narratorial omniscience); and status details (‘recording everyday gestures, habits, manners, customs, styles of furniture, clothing, decoration…and other symbolic details that might exist within a scene…’ (46)).

The problem with Wolfe’s social realist definition of New Journalism is that it only relates to one type of writing, and cannot be used to define the entire genre, as he claimed. Wolfe argues that the ‘extraordinary power’ (46) of social realism arises from the four devices listed above. He then identifies the use of these devices in relevant nonfictional texts, and from this concludes that New Journalism applies the ‘Technique’ (46) of social realism. However, there are many other texts in his co-edited anthology that bare no resemblance to the aesthetic style of ‘Fielding, Smollett,

---

Balzac, Dickens and Gogol…’ (46), and cannot be defined in this way. Wolfe is savvy enough to avoid ‘sacerdotal rules’ (46) that could place formal constraints on his definition of New Journalism, but his claim that the New Journalists ‘have wired their work into the main circuit, which is realism…’ (49) is undeniably flawed because there are too many texts that are incompatible with this theory.

Despite the provisionality of his definition, Wolfe’s realist conception has been, and continues to be, influential. In 1977, four years after the publication of Wolfe’s famous essay, John Hollowell reaffirmed the realist paradigm in his book, *Fact & Fiction: The New Journalism and the Nonfiction Novel*. Hollowell provides more inclusive criteria for New Journalism than Wolfe, listing five other elements that characterise these writers and their texts, in addition to the four realist techniques identified by Wolfe. Firstly, he says that New Journalism is characterised by the presence of novelists that temporarily turned away from fiction, such as Truman Capote and Norman Mailer, in order to create ‘documentary forms and varieties of public testimony in which the writer is placed in the role of witness to the moral dilemmas of the time.’ \(^{51}\) Secondly, there are New Journalists who do not invent characters and plots and, instead, become protagonists in their own stories, ‘frequently as a guide through a region of a contemporary hell.’ (15). Hunter S. Thompson typifies this approach. For instance, in *Hell’s Angels: A Strange and Terrible Saga*, Thompson depicts his experiences living and riding with the Oakland Chapter of the Hell’s Angels for about a year, exposing their anti-social behaviour and creed that resulted in him getting ‘badly stomped’ \(^{52}\) on Labor Day, 1966.

Hollowell’s third element of New Journalism is the way that different aspects of


narrative form, such as the novel, autobiography and the journalistic report, are blended together within a single text. Hollowell explains that this mix of narrative form ‘prompts such critical questions as: What is a novel? What are the differences between fiction and nonfiction? When is something literature and when is it mere journalism?’ (15). The fourth element that Hollowell identifies is ‘a mood of impending apocalypse...’ (15) that pervades the works in this genre. He suggests that this mood is a response to the increasing depersonalisation of mass society, the threat of cultural anarchy and a fear of the obsolescence of literature (15-6). As mentioned above, Wolfe wrote that New Journalism benefitted from America’s social fragmentation and the proliferation of different subcultures and styles of living because it had dissuaded novelists from attempting to capture the zeitgeist. Hollowell argues to the contrary, claiming that it was in fact the New Journalists who were fearful and anxious about modern life and the challenges it posed. However, he does concede in his fifth and final point that the nonfiction novel was a ‘tentative solution’ (16) to the issues that confronted fiction, proving to be ‘an appropriate form for the radically altered reality of America in an era of intense social change.’ (16).

Hollowell’s indebtedness to Wolfe is clear when he identifies the main devices of social realism in In Cold Blood, claiming that this text reads like a novel because of the way Capote blended ‘scene-by-scene reconstruction...ironic heightening of dialogue, and the skillful manipulation of point of view.’ (70). Hollowell explains that Capote conducted a comprehensive investigation of the killings and their aftermath, amassing an enormous amount of documentary material and evidence. However, since Capote was functioning as a ‘novelist’ and not a journalist, Hollowell says that he ‘had to impose a form—a narrative structure—upon the experiences he had so carefully documented.’ (71). This strategy enabled Capote to foreshadow dramatic
events and create meaning that was not apparent in its original context by carefully selecting ‘des temps forts—the significant moments…’ (71), which contributed, cumulatively, to his dramatic purpose as a novelist writing nonfiction narrative.

Hollowell also suggests that by applying a sophisticated point of view—third-person perspective—Capote was able to conceal ‘his strong personal involvement in the case and his skillful manipulation of the reader’s reactions...’ (73), illustrating how an omniscient narrator ‘promotes’ (72) objectivity even though narrative necessarily involves a process of selection and arrangement that inevitably imposes design. Hollowell explains that this design is a product of the author’s interpretation of the actual events, and concludes that ‘any attempt to write a narrative account implies establishing a “fiction” that best fits the facts as they are known.’ (74). This view is in contradistinction to Wolfe’s theory of New Journalism, which maintains that the form allows its writers to produce a work of art, while still producing journalism.53

Barbara Lounsberry identifies four constitutive features of literary journalism in *The Art of Fact: Contemporary Artists of Nonfiction* and, like Wolfe, regards ‘the scene’ as a notable feature of this type of writing. The other three features she identifies are: documentable subject matter from the ‘real’ world; exhaustive research; and fine writing in literary prose style. Lounsberry asserts that factually verifiable subject matter and exhaustive research are fundamental to the success of literary journalism, while narrative form grants it artistry, and its polished language ‘reveals that the goal all along was literature.’54 Lounsberry later added ‘simultaneous, sequential, and substitutionary narration; interior monologue; and the artful use of
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imagery, allusion, humor, and even the pyrotechnics of print itself..." to her criteria in *Writing Creative Nonfiction: Literature of Reality*, a book she co-wrote with Gay Talese. As Sonia Zdovc points out, Lounsberry was not the only theorist to build on Wolfe’s definition of New Journalism. Six years earlier, in 1984, Norman Sims added immersion reporting, accuracy, voice, structure, responsibility and symbolic representation to Wolfe’s four main devices of social realism to create a more comprehensive set of characteristics for literary journalism. However, Lounsberry says that the ‘scene’ is the form’s most recognisable trait, and instead of ‘reporting’ or ‘discussing’ an event, the literary journalist ‘recasts it in narrative form.’ She explains that the effect of transforming events into narrative form ‘is that the moment is reprised; it lives again, yet with the subtle lights and shadings of the author’s vision.’

Charles Marsh traces the structure of literary journalism to Greek tragic drama, claiming that it embraces storytelling conventions that predate the novel and the short story. Marsh asserts that the eight key plot elements of well-constructed narratives that Aristotle described in *Poetics* are inherent within the conventions of modern nonfiction narratives. The first, totality, is the notion that a narrative’s episodes all develop a core idea. The second, completeness, refers to the wholeness of the narrative structure, which has a beginning, middle and end, because literary journalists insist on complete stories. The third element, causality, is an extension of
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completeness, in which middles and ends must stem from preceding events—in other words, each incident in the narrative must arise out of the structure of the plot itself, and not appear slapdash or anomalous. The fourth, altered chronology, refers to the use of prolepsis, flashbacks and other forms of plot contrivances. The fifth, complication, is the notion that the protagonist confronts a growing challenge. Peripety, the sixth element, is the development of the protagonist through time, as his or her circumstances change due to complication. The penultimate element, discovery, is the protagonist’s change from ignorance to knowledge. The eighth and final element, dénouement, is the narrative’s culmination in a resolution and catharsis. Although Marsh’s theory is not linked to Wolfe’s social realist paradigm per se, the eight Aristotelian elements he identifies in nonfiction narrative relate to the developmental narrative structure of realism because ‘the culmination of the plot in the resolution of all mysteries and uncertainties, functions to reassure us that human existence is ultimately meaningful.’ Therefore, both Marsh and Wolfe’s models attest to the feasibility of literary journalism constructing coherent and meaningful reports of reality but differ in where they believe it originated.

The first major departure from the social realist paradigm was by Mas’ud Zavarzadeh in *The Mythopoeic Reality: The Postwar American Nonfiction Novel*. Northrup Frye’s claim that ‘literary shape cannot come from life; it comes only from literary tradition…’ captures the fundamental point this alternative theory of literary journalism tries to make. Zavarzadeh argued that the formulation of a comprehensive scheme of reality had become impossible in contemporary life because ‘new
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communication technologies make the formulation of any encompassing authoritative visions increasingly more difficult, since they produce an information overload which gives such diverse and disparate views of reality that no single interpretative frame can contain them all and still present a coherent vision of experience. In short, Zavarzadeh proposes that contemporary life promotes such diverse and disparate views of reality that the narratives produced to represent reality cannot be regarded as either factual or fictional but ‘fictual’—simultaneously factual and fictional.

Zavarzadeh says that the ‘nonfiction novel’ arose in response to the challenges of modernity by refusing to ‘neutralise’ the contingent nature of reality by transforming it into a ‘safe zone of unified meaning.’ According to this view, a nonfiction novelist is in transaction with the world; coloured by personal history and outlook, the writer chooses to resist assembling sensory impressions into significant form, or formulate a single vision of reality, and instead observes life ‘nonteleologically’ (42). Unlike a typical novelist who begins with a vision and uses appropriate details to support it, or a historian who approaches facts for their truth-value, the nonfiction novelist does not believe in the truth behind the facts because facts are the ‘objects of senses’ (47), and the only discernible elements of reality available to humans. Zavarzadeh continues:

This is, by the Modernist criteria, a “reduced reality” which eliminates, as far as possible, the pattern-making mind of the artist and substitutes for private mythologies the myths out-flowing from contemporary facts. This fiction of fact can be mapped out only in an intermediary zone of experience, located between the “factual” and the “fictional,” an area which language with its entrenched factual-fictional polarization of experience cannot currently identify. The nonfiction novel deals with this area of experience which is the matrix of reality in extreme situations. (47)
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This passage reveals how the nonfiction novelist rejects the coherent, developmental narrative structure of realism. Their texts are ‘phenomenalist’ and do not ‘totalise the chain of events and experiences (facts) in terms of either a pre-existing (a priori) interpretation of life, like a fictive novelist, or an emerging (a posteriori) truth….’ (65). A ‘phenomenalist’ use of fact in narrative is ‘post-mimetic, non-verisimilar...transcriptive, anti-symbolic, and purely literal. It is a mode of dealing with appearances as knowable senses.’ (65). The nonfiction novel is essentially the antithesis of the realist novel because it lacks any interpretive commentary and is a direct inscription of sensory data, rejecting the structural order that is necessarily imposed by plot-driven realist writers.

Zavarzadeh explains that the nonfiction novel is bi-referential: referring inwards towards the text (in-referential) and outwards towards reality (out-referential), and consequently comprises two components: an imaginary component and an experiential component (76). The imaginary component is the internal shape of the text that articulates the phenomenal world of the out-referential domain (77), and represents the writer’s aesthetic control of the material used in the narrative. The experiential component is the externally verifiable, objective world of fact that corresponds to the unique inner shape of the narrative. Since nonfiction novels are transcriptional rather than interpretational, there is no ‘plot’ or ‘characters’ in the traditional sense, and Zavarzadeh argues that both these terms hinder a clear understanding of the nonfiction novel because they are overloaded with literary connotations (77). Zavarzadeh states that realist tropes are artifices that have no basis in reality because these ‘fictional techniques [my italics] are used decoratively rather than functionally; they have, in other words, a fictional texture and not a fictual tension.’ (75).
Joan Didion would perhaps be the most obvious candidate to fit Zavarzadeh’s criteria of a nonfiction novelist because she writes in what Stanley Fish calls an ‘additive style’, which he describes as a ‘looseness, of associated nonconnectedness….’ Didion’s journalistic style is a conscious response to her lack of faith in the intelligibility of narrative form, as she explains: ‘to know that one can change the sense with every cut was to begin to perceive the experience as more electrical than ethical.’ This realisation that meaning would change with each edit meant that Didion felt that the capacity of nonfiction narrative to represent reality was seriously in doubt. In line with Zavarzadeh’s assertion that nonfiction novelists should convey a personal history and outlook in their prose, Didion felt that since she controlled and determined the meaning of the narrative, her readers had a right to know her views and perspective because it has such bearing on the story, and would let them know ‘precisely who I am and what is on my mind…’. This open disclosure of her subjectivity, along with her additive style and ‘local reaction’ to experiential reality, means that Didion typifies Zavarzadeh’s definition of the nonfiction novelist.

Similarly to Wolfe’s theory, Zavarzadeh’s phenomenalist conception of the nonfiction novel has had a lasting impact on literary journalism theory, and continues to stand as an alternative to the social realist paradigm. Most recently, in 2000, John Russell released *Reciprocities in the Nonfiction Novel*, in which he critically analyses nonfictional texts by Isak Dinesen, E.E. Cummings, Robert Byron, Primo Levi, Louis-Ferdinand Céline, Max Frisch, Honoria Murphy Donnelly, Richard Billings...
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and Michael Ondaatje. Russell argues that these texts are separate from the novel as a genre because they tend to ‘blur any centripetal devices (standard among journalists)...[and avoid]...framing and focusing on its material.’

Russell says that nonfiction novels are told from a privileged point of view and convey the writer’s personal history and outlook, and that these writers take a ‘haphazard approach to the writing task...’ (13), reiterating Zavarzadeh’s point that nonfiction novelists refuse to assemble sensory impressions into significant form. Russell also notes that these writers are ‘never taking notes...’ (12), which is consistent with Zavarzadeh’s point that nonfiction novelists observe life ‘nonteleologically’.

In his critical analysis of Isak Dinesen’s two works, Out of Africa and Shadows on the Grass, Russell exposes how dramatic power is muted by the digressiveness of the memoir writer, which illustrates ‘the nonfiction novel’s urge to veer away from established situations.’ (26). Russell explains that Dinesen’s digressive essay structure fuses ‘“condensed” ruminations with powerful novelistic structure...’ (41), as she constantly considers and re-considers her memories in the process of relating them. Russell surmises that this ‘helps make a nonfiction be what it is—relearning through the act of writing what has been forgotten...’ (45). In his analysis of The Enormous Room, Russell describes E.E. Cummings’ attempt at writing an autobiographical account of prison experiences during the first world war as like an ‘accidental man adrift’ (45), and determines from this that nonfiction novelists have a tendency of haphazardly discovering their stories, instead of approaching reality with the ‘idea of producing a journalistic tour de force.’ (59).

Finally, Russell uses Robert Byron’s text, The Road To Oxiana, to differentiate
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between the nonfiction novelist and the literary journalist. Russell explains that ‘No literary journalist would be caught speaking “shamelessly” of the methods to which he has resorted, whereas the digressive nonfiction novelist might at almost any point make that admission.’ (59). Thus, the fundamental difference between the two is nonfiction novelists are ‘reciprocators’ (haphazard, unsystematic, reactive), whereas literary journalists are ‘proprietors’ (strategic, formulaic, proactive).

Russell is not the first theorist to have differentiated between two different types of writing based on Wolfe and Zavarzadeh’s opposing conceptions of literary journalism. Ronald Weber, in The Literature of Fact, claimed that literary journalism comprised two forms: an existential form and a rational form. The existential form is epitomised by the subjective, journalistic style of Hunter S. Thompson and Joan Didion, in which the narratorial emphasis is ‘on the person of the journalist himself….’73 The rational form is exemplified in Truman Capote’s In Cold Blood and Gay Talese’s Honor Thy Father, because in both texts, ‘the “I” was sternly avoided in favor of the omniscient “eye” of the writer….’74 Weber explains that the writer’s presence can be felt in the meticulous reporting and novelistic artistry of the rational form, and therefore the existential form and the rational form both place emphasis on the ‘personal’, which leads Weber to conclude that nonfiction writing in the ’60s and ’70s had found a common centre.75

Weber criticises Wolfe for not directly addressing the argument ‘that realism springs from a false view of literature since literature can never chronicle the world, only construct versions of it.’76 Weber contends that literary journalists are not recorders but constructors, echoing Robert Scholes’ claim that ‘All writing, all
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composition, is construction. We do not imitate the world, we construct versions of it. There is no mimesis, only poiesis. No recording, only construction.\footnote{Robert Scholes, \textit{Structural Fabulation: An Essay On Fiction of the Future} (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 7.} According to Weber, literary journalists are professionally and ethically prohibited from moving imaginatively beyond the ‘facts’ or create ‘facts’ to fit an intended design. Weber opposes Zavarzadeh’s claim that the ‘ultimate meaning’ of these texts ‘lies neither in their internal aesthetic shape nor in their correspondence to the actualities of the empirical world, but in the fictuality which emerges out of the counterpointing of fact and fiction.’\footnote{Zavarzadeh, \textit{The Mythopoeic Reality}, 85.} According to this theory, ‘fictuality’ occurs because the evidence (core documentation) included in the text directs the reader’s attention to the outside world, and this ‘counterpointing’ of fact (actuality) and fiction (the text) forms ‘a self-verifying system within the book which enables us to see that the documents are not imagined.’ (85). Weber disputes this claim by arguing that the texts that Zavarzadeh uses as prime examples—namely: John Hersey’s \textit{Hiroshima}, Capote’s \textit{In Cold Blood}, and Norman Mailer’s \textit{The Armies of the Night}—do not fit such an easy blurring of the boundaries. Weber concedes that these works may reveal a ‘fact-fiction fusion’ and are also bi-referential in combining internal coherence with external correspondence, but says that they ‘remain fact-books because the writers choose to be restrained by what can be demonstrably known.’\footnote{Weber, \textit{The Literature of Fact}, 47}

Although narrative techniques may problematize claims to facticity, these texts remain works of journalism because they are anchored in fact. The raw material of literary journalism is facts, which must at all times be respected and honoured in the documentary core of the text. Narrative technique may shape these facts and deepen our understanding of events through selection, dramatisation, structure and
prose style. However, literary journalists are morally and professionally obligated by
the writer-reader contract to not lose sight of, misrepresent or fabricate factual
material. While the relationship between the narrator and the facts may vary, literary
journalists accept a responsibility to use storytelling in the service of truthfulness,
based on their best efforts at understanding and representing these facts. Weber
perhaps comes closest to accommodating the apparent contradictions that other
scholars have grappled with in defining literary journalism by focusing on this
common element. However, there remains a need for a theoretical framework for
organising these diverse texts in relation to each other, within this broad genre.

In his journal article “The New Journalism and the Image-World: Two Modes
of Organizing Experience,” David L. Eason differentiates between two modes of
literary journalism ‘based on their ways of constructing the relationship of image to
reality, observing to living, and storytelling to experience.’ The first mode,
ethnographic realism, which he later refers to as realist literary journalism (RLJ),
penetrates the public façade or image in order to reveal reality; it is based on the
assumption that observing is a passive act that the journalist has no responsibility for;
and has faith in traditional (story) models of interpretation and expression (53). The
second mode, cultural phenomenology—referred to later as modernist literary
journalism (MLJ)—describes the world in which the image and reality are
‘ecologically intertwined’, calling into question commonsensical views of reality. It
scrutinises the assumption that observing is a passive act entailing no existential
responsibility; and draws attention to the way reporting joins writer and reader in the
creation of reality (53).
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RLJ makes phenomena comprehensible for the reader by describing the actors’ experiences and then relating this depiction to a social, cultural, or historical framework. The ambiguous surfaces of contemporary reality pose no threat to the realist reporter’s ability to comprehend, discover, and communicate with his or her audience. It is a mode of literary journalism that maintains the traditional distance of human interest reporting by affirming the distinction between ‘lived’ and ‘observed’ experience, which is crucial to its ‘principle of realism which constitutes the reality to be reported as that of other.’ (54). MLJ reveals that coming to terms with disorder is not the same as making events comprehensible. It asserts that observing is a vital part of the story, and that ‘spectators not only see reality, they organise it; they constitute reality as “out there” and themselves as “neutral eyes.”’ (57). As a result, it explores the reality created by the journalist, who is both actor and spectator, and attempts to determine how this impacts on the actors and their environment. There are also important aesthetic emphases that distinguish these two modes. RLJ represents style as a communication technique ‘whose function is to reveal a story that exists “out there” in real life.’ (59). It approaches narrative construction as a problem of mediating between the experience of the subject and the reader, and its novelistic quality comes from the invisible ‘eye’ of the omniscient narrator. MLJ represents style as an epistemological strategy that constructs as well as reveals reality, and it seeks to ‘create for the reader the disorder that interpretations transform, the experiential contradictions that usually remain outside of the text…’ (62).

Scholarship on literary journalism is almost evenly split between texts that attempt to define the genre and those that concentrate on determining the factual standing of the form. The remaining four critical works to be analysed in this chapter concern the latter research trend. John Hellmann, for instance, proposes that New
Journalism, in its most essential methods and concerns, is a genre of fiction because it deals with ‘fact through fable.’ Hellmann accepts Zavarzadeh’s claim that the nonfiction novel is a product of the external world and the internal mind but disputes its bi-referentiality, claiming that the aesthetic or fictional aspect of a nonfiction novel ‘is the construction of the text, whatever its subject, as a work of artistic design and intention so that it finally, or ultimately, refers to itself.’ Essentially this is a rejection of Zavarzadeh’s claim that the documentary core of a nonfiction novel can be configured to correspond with an externally verifiable reality, so fact and fiction converge and the text becomes both in-referential and out-referential (bi-referential). Instead, Hellmann contends that nonfiction novels are in fact self-referential (or purely in-referential) because there is an ‘illusory separation of fictional and factual writing—illusory because it seems to separate aesthetic form and purpose form a certain subject matter: fact.’

Although Hellmann reveals that Zavarzadeh had a significant influence on his work, he not only rejects the claim that nonfiction novels are bi-referential but also that they resist presenting a coherent vision of experience. He contends that New Journalism exploits the transformational resources of human perception and imagination to seek out a more complete experience of the event and then re-creates that experience into a personally shaped ‘fiction’ that communicates its wholeness and resonance. Whereas Hollowell had claimed that writing a narrative of a real event implies establishing a ‘fiction’, Hellmann insists that New Journalism is fiction because it takes factual material and presents it ‘in the forms of fiction.’

According to Hellmann, New Journalism’s ultimate aim is an artistic one because,
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even though the writers tie themselves to actuality, they are using their imagination to create a meaningful design from their experiences (25). By defining New Journalism as a form that utilises the basic powers of fiction to construct an ordered, meaningful world (12), Hellmann’s theory appears to be in line with Wolfe’s social realist theory. However, there is one crucial difference: Hellmann says that a text can have an empirically verified documentary core and still be fiction, which leads him to define New Journalism as a form of fiction with a subject of fact (33).

Eric Heyne responds to Hellmann’s claims about the fictionality of New Journalism by questioning whether a text necessarily loses ‘touch with the “external world” insofar as it develops an engaging form.’ He argues that Hellmann’s theory is based on the assumption that good historical writing must either approach fiction or remain aesthetically displeasing in form (483). Heyne concedes that fiction and literary journalism are both narrative forms and therefore share ‘technical similarities’ (484) in their construction of meaning but says that Hellmann has used this point as leverage in order to counterpose New Journalism against what he considers to be a ‘good form of journalism’ (conventional journalism) rather than using it ‘to clarify our understanding of good writing of both kinds.’ (484).

Heyne states that the aim of his article is to search ‘for the characteristic pleasure of literary nonfiction (example: the dual satisfaction of specific truth-claims and profound or vivid patterns)....’ (488) He concedes that he ultimately fails in this objective, and that his desire to ‘get from “What I find valuable about In Cold Blood” to “What I find valuable about all nonfiction narrative”...’ (489) was an overly ambitious venture. However, Heyne asserts that our cultural experience and
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understanding of common nonfictional texts, such as newspaper articles, historical
texts, and courtroom transcripts, demand different sets of expectations and responses
in order to be interpreted. Yet, in the case of experimental forms of nonfictional texts,
such as literary journalism, for instance, the reader ‘is not able to decide ahead of time
which epistemological principles are to be in force—unless we privilege certain
conventions.’ (485). Readers who choose to privilege literary conventions when
reading a nonfiction narrative, for instance, would have different expectations and a
different response to the text than readers who privilege the strict standards of
conventional journalism. Heyne promotes reading with an open mind to determine
‘which conventions will be adhered to and which ignored or tested by a particular
text.’ (485).

In light of this, Heyne attempts to create an empirically valid method for
determining factual adequacy in literary journalism. He asserts that the writer-reader
contract is based on conventions that are not only a priori and derived from a
collective understanding of the generic rules of the form, but also by the principles
that the author claims to have abided by. On this basis, Heyne says that the
discoveries made by Philip K. Thompkin implicating Capote in the invention of key
scenes in In Cold Blood prove that Capote had violated the principles that he himself
had avowed in the text. By not abiding by his own rules (485), the reader is invited ‘to
make a decision about its factual adequacy, not merely according to a priori principle
but by the rules Capote indicates are in force in his book.’ (485).

Heyne identifies ‘two different kinds of truths—accuracy and meaning—for
which different principles are important.’ (486). Accuracy is determined by the level
of correspondence between the representation of events and the actual events
themselves, whereas meaning is ‘much more nebulous, covering virtually everything
one does with “the facts” once they have been given an accurate shape.’ (486). Heyne says that the identification of accuracy and meaning are useful because they enable researchers to determine different sorts of claims and strategies in literary journalism. With respect to *In Cold Blood*, he argues that Capote did not achieve the ‘immaculate’ correspondence of events that the author had stated, and therefore failed to tell the truth in respect to accuracy (486). Heyne accepts that complex truths ‘may be well served by inventions, exaggerations, slanting, and other transformations of fact.’ (486). However, since the inaccuracies concern the character Perry Smith, whose ‘precise motivations are at the thematic and aesthetic heart of the book…’ (486), they are fatal for the book’s truth-value. Heyne explains that in select circumstances, a text can have flaws in its representational accuracy and still have truth-value because ‘there is no transcendent connection between space/time events and narratives of those events…’ (486). Yet, if the inaccuracies are intentional—as in the case of *In Cold Blood*—then the text automatically loses its truth-value. Heyne’s main point is that readers and critics should consider the author’s intentions when evaluating a nonfiction novel’s value in regard to truth and facticity.

Heyne’s focus on reader expectations and responses to nonfiction narrative represents a unique research trend that bypasses the problem of defining literary journalism and instead takes a more literary critical approach that focuses on analysis of the various rhetorical strategies that are used (486). W. Ross Winterowd’s book, *The Rhetoric of the “Other” Literature*, is perhaps the most comprehensive rhetorical analysis of literary journalism. Winterowd says that the rhetorical elements of *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos*, as well as *form*, account for ‘esthetic reading: immersion in a text of
Winterowd states that every text has ‘elements of expression, information, and appeal to audience (i.e. ethos, logos, and pathos).’ (xiii). To explain this notion, he uses speech act theory to show that understanding a sentence requires the attribution of ‘illocutionary force; that is, you must take the utterance as a statement, claim, promise, threat...If you cannot determine what kind of illocution has been enacted, you do not understand the sentence even though you may understand all of the words in it.’ (xiii). Therefore, if a respondent doubts the credibility of a speaker then there is a problem with ethos; if the speaker fails to adequately inform the respondent then there is a problem with logos; and, finally, if the speaker has chosen the wrong addressee then there is a problem with pathos (30). Winterowd explains that he is recapitulating the ‘classical analysis of argument based on the character and credibility of the speaker (ethos), on the nature of the audience (pathos), and on the subject matter itself (logos).’ (30).

This type of analysis has important implications for literary journalism because it provides a tool for debunking claims that ‘the differences between fact and fiction writing were mere conventions.’ According to Winterowd, ‘Literariness, fictionality, and poeticality are not functions of the text itself, but result from the way in which the reader takes the text, using the appropriateness conditions that constitute the genre.’ (32). If a reader considers a nonfictional text to be true then essential conditions for assertions would apply and ‘the work would be taken as representing an actual state of affairs.’ (32). Winterowd argues that the boundaries between fact and fiction are ‘sharply drawn’ (32) through the writer-reader contract, wherein both parties share an agreement about the conditions that are imposed on the text and how
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it is comprehended. By analysing the ‘Rhetoric of presentation’ in respect to *ethos, logos, pathos* and *form*, Winterowd identifies the conditions that determine whether the writer and reader agree that the contract has been honoured, and explains that if ‘everything “adds up”; one’s attention remains “endophoric”; one does not pause to consider the information or truth value of the text.’ (xii).

In *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative*, Phyllis Frus is less impartial than Winterowd in her rhetorical analysis of literary journalism. Frus’ aim is to expose the hidden political motivations, ‘false objectivity and a kind of narrative positivism...’ in aestheticized objective narration. Essentially, Frus is targeting realist forms of literary journalism, and claims that her concept and strategy of ‘reflexive reading’ can uncover the ‘process of production’ that occurs in these texts. Reflexive reading involves focusing on form rather than content, and paying close attention to the processes of production of the text, such as the social, political, and historical conditions of the writer and writing. Frus explains that this will allow readers to determine and assess the text’s ‘auto-referentiality’ (32), and discover how the text works to create the ‘illusion’ of reality.

According to Frus, New Journalism is a form of nonfictional writing that adopts the style of the actors and events that it reports on, as exemplified by Tom Wolfe’s use of free indirect prose in *The Kandy-Kolored Tangerine Flake Streamline Baby*, which leads Frus to surmise that these texts are ‘more process that product....’ (113) Frus’ claims contradict Wolfe’s assertions in “The New Journalism,” in which he prioritises content over form because he felt that contemporary novelists were
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‘strangling themselves on what is now a very orthodox aesthetics based on form…’\(^8\) despite it being possible to write ‘in exactly the same realistic forms as Balzac and Thackeray and Dickens and still be fresh because the material, the social world, would be different…’\(^9\). In short, Wolfe is suggesting that form does not have to change because content is always changing. Frus suggests that New Journalism is suited to reflexive reading because its style calls attention to its own process of constructing reality, creating a dialectic with the reader, who is encouraged to emphasise the priority of the narrative over the events in the reading, and expose the construction of the objective, factual world (121).

Frus distrusts ‘objectively narrated texts’ because writers of these claim to have created a faithful representation of reality as it appears to the eye in a neutral and nonpartisan fashion (91). According to Frus, this type of writing has created the paradigm of news as information, which is based on top-down communication that discourages reflexive reading. Paraphrasing Bertolt Brecht, she says that objective narration isolates readers, leaving them with only a personal privatising consciousness; one that can be managed, its fears contained, its catharsis controlled through plots that are contrived so that ‘we “experience only the spiritual agitation of heroes”’ rather than “discovering the causal complexities of society.”’ (113). Frus says that in the ’60s and ’70s objective narration called for a form more appropriate to its content (133) and this acted as a catalyst for New Journalism, implying that realist texts, such as *In Cold Blood* and *The Executioner’s Song*, are not part of the genre.

Frus’ theory of narrative is based on the assumption that events depicted in the text are not true and are merely ‘literary’ (158). This position means that all

narratives, whether based on fact or fiction, have the same status. According to Frus, realist texts refer to sign systems that society is accustomed to calling ‘reality’. Therefore, irrespective of whether or not the ‘referents of signs’ (texts) have historical signifieds or not is an irrelevant distinction on a textual level. It is only when the narrative draws attention to itself through self-referentiality, as exemplified by New Journalism, that readers ‘cease to look “through” the glass to the world, but rather, see the glass itself.’ (158). Essentially, Frus is arguing that all texts, whether they purport to be nonfictional or not, are a self-contained sign system. This is a more extreme position than John Hellmann’s, which merely claimed that New Journalism is self-referential because its literary techniques create ‘personally shaped’ fictions. Frus, however, is claiming that all nonfiction narratives are self-referential because reality is necessarily filtered through personal observations, research, language, and all the various forms of representation that are used to communicate with readers. At best, therefore, journalists produce ‘partial reports of what seemed to have happened…’ (176). However, as Barbara Foley points out, Frus valorises texts that problematize their own truth-claims and direct attention to their own conditions of production and are therefore best equipped to ‘repudiate positivist objectivism and grasp the textual construction of reality….’ And yet, she ignores the fact that even these types of texts ‘still contain a “content” that calls out for assessment separate from the form of their articulation.’

This Literature Review has covered the main body of modern critical and theoretical scholarship on nonfiction narrative since New Journalism. It has shown how Tom Wolfe’s social realism conception of New Journalism and Mas’ud
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Zavarzadeh’s theory of the nonfiction novel have influenced the theoretical development of literary journalism, creating a schism that has led to a lack of consensus regarding a working definition and normative terminology for this genre. It has also shown that there has been a great deal of speculation over the factual veracity of nonfiction narrative. It is clear, therefore, that literary journalism scholarship not only calls out for a schematic but flexible typology that incorporates realist and phenomenalist types of writing. By making use of Weber’s observation and building on Eason’s typology in the next chapter—Theoretical Framework & Approach—this thesis attempts to move beyond the impasse created by the schism between Wolfe and Zavarzadeh’s theories. Literary journalism would also benefit from a reading practice that is sensitive to the factual standing of this genre, validating it as a legitimate form of news. Chapter 4, Method, seeks to achieve this by outlining Anabela Carvalho’s critical discourse analysis and Risto Kunelius’s narrative dimensions in journalism, which are both applied in the close readings thereafter.
Theoretical Framework & Approach

In an effort to formulate a definition of literary journalism that not only includes a range of texts but also is specific enough to be a valuable analytical tool, this thesis builds its theoretical framework and approach around David L. Eason’s typology of literary journalism. Eason divides the genre into two categories: Realist Literary Journalism (RLJ) and Modernist Literary Journalism (MLJ). These two modes of reportage are derived from the social realist and phenomenalist conceptions of literary journalism, respectively. The major benefit of Eason’s typology is that it does not base its definition and typology of literary journalism on literary or textual features alone. As a factual form of writing, the literary journalism genre is contingent upon truth and reality and requires its writers to construct narratives that accurately depict the circumstances being reported. Apart from this ethical obligation, however, there are no rules or specific prescriptions dictating what a literary journalist can or and cannot do in representing reality.93 As Michael J. Steinberg explains, ‘A particular piece might by turns be lyrical, expository, meditative, informational, reflective, self-interrogative, exploratory, analytical, and/or whimsical.’94 Viewed from a literary critical perspective, the genre appears heterogeneous, lacking in any distinctive or common traits other than its signification of actual events, making it ‘difficult, if not impossible, to pin down.’95

Eason solves this issue of heterogeneity by conceiving literary journalism as a combined literary and cultural act in which particular attention is paid to the
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relationship of literary style to the experience that it embodies.\textsuperscript{96} According to Eason, the story form is utilised in literary journalism to both communicate and comprehend (58), with narrative techniques constituting ‘formal methods used in making sense of all kinds of situations.’\textsuperscript{97} That is, literary journalists make sense of their experiences through the imposition of a narrative line, ‘which connects and interrelates diverse strands of experience into a meaningful paradigm…’\textsuperscript{98} The resulting product (the report) ‘is not a “natural” statement of “the way things are” but an interpretation mediated by the “multiple choices” which culture provides for interpreting experience.’\textsuperscript{99} These choices are dependent on the perspective or ‘frame’ used by the journalist to see and know the world,\textsuperscript{100} whether it is a conventional inverted pyramid article structure or a plot-driven narrative construction. However, with the latter, the literary act of shaping experience into ‘a meaningful paradigm’ is also a cultural act because it produces ‘a symbolic structure in which facts function to disclose a larger meaning…’\textsuperscript{101}, the significance of which emerges from the enactment of cultural paradigms that ‘contributes to our cultural meaning-making.’\textsuperscript{102}

RLJ and MLJ are two alternative ways of ‘responding to reality’\textsuperscript{103} and organising the experience of reporting. Eason argues that RLJ involves ‘naturalizing discrepant views of reality within its own narrative conventions…’ (54); no matter how strange or bizarre these views may be, they pose ‘no threat to established ways of

\textsuperscript{96} Eason, “The New Journalism and the Image-World,” 58. [All subsequent references in this chapter refer to this particular article].
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knowing and communicating…and the reporter is still able to state, “That’s the way it is.” (54). In RLJ, reality is made comprehensible to the audience by a process that involves more than merely describing the scene and the actors’ experiences: it must be explained ‘by relating it to a social, cultural, or historical framework.’ (53). In order to achieve this, realist reporters must be simultaneously both near and far from their subjects, vicariously penetrating their experiences ‘while holding an aesthetic distance that allows the transformation of the experience within a set of narrative conventions into a story.’ (55-6). Eason suggests that RLJ attempts to reify a ‘commonplace cultural distinction’ (56) between lived and observed experience. Style is presented ‘as a communicational technique whose function is to reveal a story that exists “out there” in reality…’ (59), with the reporter confronting ‘narrative construction as a problem of mediating between the experience of the subject and the reader.’ (59).

In contrast, MLJ ‘describes what it feels like to live in a world in which there is no reliable frame of reference to explain “what it all means”.’ (52). According to Eason, this mode conducts a ‘multi-layered interrogation of communication, including that between writer and reader, as a way of constructing reality, and by the hesitancy to foreclose the question “Is this real?” by invoking conventional ways of understanding.’ (52). MLJ deems traditional ways of making sense to be either inappropriate or ineffective for the empirical understanding of contemporary reality, and accordingly represents ‘the image-world as a realm that blurs traditional distinctions between fantasy and reality.’ (54). Its aesthetic ‘arises out of an inability to state “the way things are”.’ (59). MLJ chronicles the interaction between consciousness and events; the story that is told ‘is not one discovered out there in the world but the story of the writer’s efforts to impose order on those events.’ (60).
Instead of maintaining a cultural distinction between lived and observed experience, MLJ makes observation—‘grounded in an epistemology and an ethics...’ (57)—a vital part of the story. Modernist reporters therefore explore ‘the reality that actor and spectator create in their interaction, the dynamics through which each is created in the reporting process.’ (57).

Although RLJ and MLJ represent different ways of interpreting and representing reality, they should not be regarded as entirely distinct categories of literary journalism. For over a hundred years, scholars and critics have defined literary journalism as a consummately personal and subjective form of factual writing. In 1904, for instance, H.W. Boynton remarked that ‘many writers of power whose permanent and absorbing task is journalism...[produced works that are]...unmistakably informed with personality....’\footnote{Henry Walcott Boynton, “The Literary Aspect of Journalism,” \textit{The Atlantic Monthly}, vol. 93 (January 1904), 847.} Seven decades later, James E. Murphy described literary journalism as ‘an artistic, creative, literary reporting form with three basic traits: dramatic techniques; intensive reporting; and reporting of generally acknowledged subjectivity [my italics]...’\footnote{James E. Murphy, “The New Journalism: A Critical Perspective,” in Applegate \textit{Literary Journalism}, xiv.} Three years before Murphy’s comments, in 1971, Michael L. Johnson claimed that the ‘principle distinguishing mark of New Journalistic style is the writer’s attempt to be personalistic, involved, and creative in relation to the events he reports and comments upon.’\footnote{Michael J. Johnson, \textit{The New Journalism: The Underground Press, the Artists of Nonfiction, and Changes in the Established Media} (Lawrence, Manhattan, Wichita: University of Kansas, 1971), 46.}

Lee Wilkins explains that in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, literary journalists began ‘to rely on an internally defined reality to help explain the objective facts to which traditional
CHAPTER 3: Theoretical Framework & Approach

journalists were welded.’ 107 Creating reports anchored in both an internal and external reality put literary journalism at odds with conventional newswriting practices due to the latter’s firmly entrenched principles concerning the ‘separation of facts and opinions…[and]…the journalist functioning as the impartial relayer of those facts.’ 108 As noted by Steven Maras, although journalistic objectivity is multi-faceted and diverse in its application and interpretation, 109 one feature that is almost universally regarded as a key aspect is journalism’s detachment, which involves ‘recounting events in a disinterested or impersonal way, aligned with precepts of neutrality and balance.’ 110 Literary journalism precludes detachment because, as John C. Hartsock explains, in its most basic sense it tries to narrow the gulf between subject and object, and this ‘subjective ambition could not bode well for the form in the face of the rising critical hegemony posed by “objective” journalism.’ 111

Despite claims of a shift towards acceptance by the daily newspaper industry in the U.S, 112 the general perception of literary journalism is still one of an overtly personal and subjective form that ‘flies in the face of accepted notions of “objectivity”…’ 113. This may have acted as a barrier to the genre’s development because, by not being either hard news or fiction, it has fallen between two historically powerful norms. Also, as Jesse Swigger observes, there was a belief,
which had its origins in New Journalism, that ‘objective writing was not only untenable, but undesirable.’ ¹¹⁴ Certain literary journalism theorists continue to censure any perceived objectivity they detect within the genre, including objectified narration and other techniques associated with the social realist tradition, because this is believed to be ‘hampered by the same positivist attitude that permeates the fiction of objectivity….’ ¹¹⁵ Insofar as the ‘realist’ reporter can be seen to share the same neutral and measured communicational style as the hard news journalist, proponents of the subjective model of literary journalism, such as Kathy Smith, Phyllis Frus, and John Hellmann, have attacked RLJ on the grounds that it has the same ideological underpinnings as conventional journalism. Another common concern about realism in literary journalism is that ‘the narrator as “almighty author” can shape or frame the voices of problematic interactants within the story by means of rhetorical devices, which enables him to gain authentification and persuasive power while refraining from explicit evaluations.’ ¹¹⁶

Kathy Smith’s critical analysis of John McPhee’s narratorial strategy in A Sense of Where You Are: Bill Bradley at Princeton exemplifies the distrust that some critics have for realism in literary journalism. Smith argues that McPhee disguises himself as the ‘recorder’ of events so that he can ‘temper the mediation between fact and story to promote the “real illusion” that structure itself provides a natural and absolute system of identification rather than a true replica that is produced in the

¹¹⁵ Frus, The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative, 94.
midst of narrative adventure.' ¹¹¹⁷ Smith criticises McPhee for manipulating voice and perspective and altering the exact chronology of events so that he can distance himself from the events he is reporting and preserve the story’s objectivity. However, as Hayden White has noted, it is because ‘real events do not offer themselves as stories that their narrativization is so difficult.' ¹¹¹⁸ This means that all nonfiction narratives can be dismissed as fiction ‘due to the fundamentally specular nature of language...’ ¹¹¹⁹, even though it seems reasonable that McPhee should be entitled to use any literary technique or narrative structure he wants to so long as that which he recognises as true (verum) and that which he himself has made (factum) are one and the same (verum factum). ¹²⁰ As William Howarth explains, in McPhee’s work structural order is the main ingredient used to attract his readership because ‘Order establishes where the writer and reader are going and when they will arrive at a final destination.’ ¹²¹

However, Smith suggests that by transforming his experiences into story form using the narrative conventions of logic, order and meaning to structure reality, McPhee has chosen to represent reality in a manner that ‘always depends on artifice...’ ¹²² and has created a structure that is ‘the ground for the ideology of objectivity in journalism.’ ¹²³ Smith’s analysis of McPhee’s work shows how realist techniques are considered to be a violation of the subjective ideal of literary journalism, a view based on the misconception that omniscient narration entails
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detachment. This involves a failure to recognise that literary journalism has ‘made use of objectivity as it saw fit, variously adopting, adapting, and rejecting its rules…’\textsuperscript{124} and therefore does not offer an absolute ideological alternative to conventional reporting.

Smith is not alone in her critique of objectivity in realist literary journalism. Matthew Ricketson argues that a number of leading practitioners, heeding the controversy surrounding Truman Capote’s \textit{In Cold Blood}, have moved ‘away from writing in an omniscient authorial voice because they appreciate it conveys a sense of knowingness that is out of place when you are trying to convey events and issues that in all likelihood are contested, contingent and still unfolding.’\textsuperscript{125} Eason, who contends that RLJ displays a ‘faith in the capability of traditional models of interpretation and expression, particularly the story form, to reveal the real…’ (53), shares this view. However, Eason does not take into account that narrative always has a point of view.\textsuperscript{126} As Ronald Weber observes, despite the omniscient narration in \textit{In Cold Blood}, ‘the writer was distinctly felt in the re-creation of events and in the selection and arrangement of the material.’\textsuperscript{127} This view is supported by John Hollowell, who asserts that ‘Capote must have realized that the final narrative presents only one version of the facts…’\textsuperscript{128} because no matter how neutral the presentation, ‘there is no mistaking the author’s point of view; characters, actions, revealing details are all saturated with values that the author can count on readers to recognize—and, ideally,
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share.'\textsuperscript{129} Weber and Hollowell’s analyses of \textit{In Cold Blood} suggest that omniscient narration does not erase the writer’s subjective presence. Rather, it is perceived in every detail used to construct the narrative world, which debunks the claim that the writer is detached from his or her material.

The assumption that literary journalists use omniscient narration and other realist devices to create the illusion of the text’s autonomy or to conflate their narratives with a certain factual authority\textsuperscript{130} stems from the genre’s aesthetic association with social realism. As Robert Anchor explains, ‘A century ago Realism was in its prime; today it is under attack.’\textsuperscript{131} Superficially, RLJ can be seen to operate in a typically mimetic manner, faithfully mirroring everyday reality\textsuperscript{132} and exploiting a style that is generally acknowledged as direct, transparent, literal and ‘characterised primarily by confidence in the representational function of language.’\textsuperscript{133} Yet, unlike Realism, RLJ is not based on an ‘assumption of a familiar, ordered, intelligible world to which literature refers.’\textsuperscript{134} While it may represent a continuation of Realism’s aesthetic, RLJ is nonetheless an entirely independent, contemporary form of writing that ‘affirms that reality is socially and culturally constructed…’\textsuperscript{135} It does this by producing texts that faithfully mirror everyday reality while also acknowledging its ‘own status as a constructed, aesthetic artefact…’\textsuperscript{136}; or, to use Barthes idiom: ‘Its
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task is to put the mask in place and at the same time to point it out.’ In this regard, RLJ is typically postmodern in that its writers ‘use and abuse, install and then destabilize convention...self-consciously pointing both to their own inherent paradoxes and provisionality...’ both inscribing and subverting their mimetic engagement with the world. Most importantly though, by working within this particular type of discourse yet simultaneously contesting it, RLJ demonstrates a knowingness about how reality is ideologically constructed and does not, as Eason claims, ‘suggest “This is reality”.’

MLJ differs from RLJ in its explicit creation of ontological uncertainty. This is achieved by MLJ questioning its own status as nonfiction and foregrounding the epistemological foundation of its writing strategies, exposing the shaping presence of reporter ‘and the pressure of his personality and consciousness on what was finally written.’ This contrasts with RLJ, which raises questions about its status as nonfiction through its implicit critique of its own realist techniques. However, despite radical differences in their methods, RLJ and MLJ both convey a highly subjective and personal reality (even though RLJ pretends not to). Steve M. Barkin argues that the ‘adoption of fictional techniques signals an explicit return to the storyteller’s emotional function.’ The story form allows realist reporters to recount the past in a factual way but also embeds their factual accounts in a ‘deep cultural context—one which connects the objective facts of the event with the cultural facts of symbols and

---

141 Eason, “New Journalism, Metaphor and Culture,” 142.
myths." Despite the neutral, objective and impersonal tone found in RLJ, such embedding of factual content in a deep cultural context means that these types of texts relate highly personalised, interpretative and evocative accounts of reality that exemplify the storyteller’s emotional function. It is inappropriate, therefore, to associate RLJ with conventional ‘objective’ journalism since it shares some important characteristics with MLJ, such as focusing on ‘events as symbolic of some deeper cultural ideology or mythology, emphasise the world view of the individual or group under study, and show an absorption in the aesthetics of the reporting process in creating texts that read like novels or short stories.” MLJ and RLJ are essentially two sides of the same coin because they focus on the deeper cultural significance of events and utilise the storyteller’s emotional function so that the texts read like novels. That is, they both reify the subjective ideal of literary journalism.

In order to reconcile RLJ with the subjective ideal of literary journalism, this thesis applies Joseph M. Webb’s interpretation of romantic and rationalist journalism in conjunction with Eason’s typology. According to Webb, Rationalism is based on the following assumptions: the key characteristic of mankind is an ability to think, reason and have ideas; reality is an external phenomenon understood via the senses; human beings are fundamentally alike; society is basically static and unchanging; and reality must be ‘cut up into pieces, with each piece digested separately.” The ideal of rationalism is, of course, objective journalism. Romanticism, on the other hand, assumes: the primacy of human diversity; society as dynamic and not static; and a wholistic, rather than atomistic, view of reality, that is, ‘assuming that life cannot be understood when it is cut up in little pieces.’ (39). It considers man to be primarily a
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feeling, emotional and instinctual being, and suggests that ‘those elements of his being…must be described and reported if man is to be understood.’ (39). Romanticism in literary journalism proceeds from the premise ‘that the Reality to be reported is primarily internal, inside human beings; and the methodological problem…is to find a way inside the human being written about.’ (39). According to Webb, there was a surge of romanticism in literary journalism in the wake of New Journalism, which was part of a ‘wider social upsurge of Romantic notions and ideas in numerous areas of intellectual work, cultural production and life style.’ (40). Lee Wilkins argues that literary journalism ‘sank its intellectual roots in the romantic tradition...’ such that emotion had ‘an important and sometimes crucial place in [its] work.’

Jerrold E. Hogle explains that one overall Romantic stance has been called into question in recent years because there has been ‘so much “over-systemizing and simplifying” of a retrospective construct called “Romanticism”’ that the label has become problematic as a way of describing a cacophonous totality of conflicting voices, ideologies, gender roles, styles, and modes of publication….’ This begs the question as to the appropriateness of terms associated with a literary genre or artistic movement that are used in this thesis—including ‘modernism’ and ‘realism’, which are not commonly associated with nonfiction narrative written in the late 20th and 21st century. However, it is important to note that these terms are only used in this thesis insofar as they are articulated by the original journal article or theory from which they are derived. This thesis does not claim that ‘romantic’ literary journalism, for
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instance, is in any way related to the works of William Blake, Percy Bysshe Shelley or William Wordsworth. Rather, the term ‘romantic’ merely refers to journalism that is concerned with being ‘primarily internal, inside human beings…’, as specified by Webb.

Webb has constructed a definitional framework that places the concepts of rationalism and romanticism at opposing ends of a continuum, with texts situated along this continuum depending on how influenced they are by either ideal (40). Combining Webb’s framework and Eason’s typology allows RLJ and MLJ to be conceived, not as distinct categories, but as different points on a sliding scale ranging from ‘objective’ to ‘subjective’ journalism. This reframing enables researchers to focus on literary journalism’s narrative techniques and to assess how these are used to: communicate the internal, psychological reality of actors; convey an emotional or moral vision; and place emphasis not only on what is known ‘but on the process of knowing itself…’150 Based on this information, each text can be positioned on Webb’s continuum.

With its rationalist aesthetic but romantic intent, RLJ can be situated closer than objective journalism to the romantic ideal of journalism but not as close as MLJ. The following diagram provides a rough approximation of where RLJ and MLJ might be situated on Webb’s continuum:
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The six literary journalistic texts analysed in this thesis can also be located on the RLJ/MLJ spectrum of Webb’s continuum, depending on how influenced they are by either romanticism or rationalism, as shown below:

Hartsock explains that literary journalism ‘exists on a narrative spectrum or continuum somewhere between an unattainable objectified world and an incomprehensible solipsistic subjectivity…’\(^{151}\). Accordingly, this thesis is structured in such a way that each chapter progresses from the RLJ (objective) end of the continuum towards the MLJ (subjective) end to give the reader a sense of the range, diversity and fluidity represented within the genre. A further aim is to illustrate how, despite RLJ’s avoidance of the ‘I’ in favour of the omniscient ‘eye’ of the writer,\(^{152}\) both RLJ and MLJ exploit the transformational resources of human perception and imagination.\(^{153}\) Woven together into a complex interrelationship, neither proceeds independently of the other but rather they merge and overlap, with both working toward the same goal, albeit using different methods.
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Method

In order to pay equal attention to both modes, this thesis conducts a close textual analysis on three works of RLJ—David Simon’s *Homicide*, Thomas Keneally’s *Schindler’s Ark*, and Francisco Goldman’s *The Art of Political Murder*—and then three works of MLJ—Helen Garner’s *The First Stone*, Scott Raab’s *The Whore of Akron* and William T. Vollmann’s *Riding Toward Everywhere*. According to Elfriede Fürsich, textual analysis (TA) does not draw upon a unified intellectual and methodological tradition and is ‘often poorly defined, and is employed in myriad ways.’\(^\text{154}\) Stand-alone qualitative TA of media texts has been criticised by Greg Philo because it does not ‘include the study of key production factors in journalism or the analysis of audience understanding.’\(^\text{155}\) Responding to this critique, Fürsich argues that media texts ‘present a distinctive discursive moment between encoding and decoding that justifies special scholarly engagement…[because]…the narrative character of media content, its potential as a site of ideological negotiation and its impact as mediated “reality” necessitates interpretation in its own right.’\(^\text{156}\)

Following Fürsich’s approach to TA, this thesis concentrates on the ‘narrative character’ of literary journalism. However, since literary journalism is a factual form of writing that implicates real people and events ‘out there’ in reality, it is important to not rely solely on the primary texts but to include other, external sources of information, such as news articles, interviews, and competing historical accounts in order to validate the writer’s version of events. It is also important to study each
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writer’s reportorial methods, their access and exposure to the events reported and their relationship with the actors. In addition, it is necessary to consider their intentions in reporting the stories, otherwise, as Philo suggests, it would be impossible to ‘comment on the difference between rhetoric and reality in terms of the intentions of the speaker, the validity of representations and the relation between accounts that are featured and alternative versions of truth.’

To ensure that the TA in this thesis is balanced and informed by these key considerations, Anabela Carvalho’s critical discourse analysis (CDA) framework has been adopted because it offers a pragmatic set of research strategies that enable the close readings to be informed by ‘contextual factors such as the historic contingencies of the text, the investigation of social actors connected to the text and the impact of the text on various constituencies.’ Carvalho’s methodological framework for analysing media discourse is divided into two aspects: textual analysis and contextual analysis. Only textual analysis will be used in this thesis as Carvalho’s contextual analysis method was devised for analysing various representations of an issue in news media, either at the time of writing (Comparative-synchronic Analysis), or in the sequence of discursive constructions over time (Historical-diachronic Analysis). Since this thesis draws on the research tradition of literary studies and focuses on a series of primary texts that no longer concern topical news events, this methodological aspect is not relevant.

The textual analysis component of Carvalho’s CDA framework and methodology is split into six aspects based on the ‘dimensions’ (167) of the text that
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matter most to the construction of meaning. The first dimension, ‘Layout and Structural Organisation,’ relates to the ‘surface’ elements in a newspaper or media text, ‘such as the section in which it was published, the page number, the size of the article, and whether it was accompanied by visual elements (photographs, graphics or others)...’ (167) Carvalho states that these elements ‘say something about the valuation and categorization of the issue by a given news outlet, with implications for audience perception.’ (167). Essentially, Carvalho is urging attention to be paid to the report’s ‘supra-textual design’ \(^{160}\), which encompasses the ‘global visual language of a document’ \(^{161}\) and operates in three modes: textual (typographical cues), spatial (design, arrangement and use of space) and graphic (icons and images).\(^{162}\) Although these three supra-textual elements can be organised into three groups for analysis, Charles Kostelnick explains that ‘within a document they work in concert—modifying, complementing, and constraining each other while creating a global visual language that guides the readers from the top down.’ \(^{163}\) For Carvalho, the ‘surface’ elements (textual, spatial and graphic) reveal the structural organisation of the text, which ‘plays a key role in the definition of what is at stake, as well as in the overall interpretation of an issue.’ (167).

The second dimension, ‘Objects,’ refers to topics or themes and is intended to capture ‘the idea that discourse constitutes rather than just “refers to” the realities at stake.... ’ (167). Carvalho’s theory of discourses is derived from Michel Foucault’s definition of discourses as practices that systematically form the objects of which they
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Carvalho uses the example of climate change to explain the notion that discourse constitutes reality rather than simply referring to it:

In the case of climate change, for example, the broader objects to be constructed may be economics, government or nature. More specific ones may be, for instance, how climate change impacts agriculture. A related question to be asked at this stage of the analysis is: what events/specific issues are associated to the broader issue under consideration? This question is particularly relevant for complex issues like climate change, which has many dimensions, and therefore can be tackled from many angles and perspectives. (167-8)

By identifying specific objects (such as a new road network or an agricultural issue) and mapping their connection to broader topics or themes (in this example, climate change), Carvalho is promoting a way of evaluating the ‘political standing’ (168) of a discourse using inductive reasoning. In this approach, identifying ‘objects’ is seen as ‘an important step towards deconstructing and understanding the role of discourses.’ (167).

The third dimension, ‘Actors,’ denotes the ‘individuals or institutions that are either quoted or referred to in the text.’ (168). Carvalho explains that the term ‘actor’ can mean both social agent (someone who has the capacity to do something) and character (in a story) because actors are ‘both subjects—they do things—and objects—they are talked about.’ (168). This duality echoes Mas’ud Zavarzadeh’s theory of the ‘bi-referentiality’ of literary journalism, which simultaneously points inwards towards the characters in a text and outwards towards actual people ‘out there’ in reality (social actors). The main benefit of using the term ‘actor’ is that it acknowledges the existence in reality of individuals depicted in these texts, and allows the inappropriate literary critical term ‘character’ to be avoided.

Carvalho describes how texts play a major role in constructing the image of social actors and defining their relations and identities, and how an ‘essential aspect in
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the study of actors in texts is their perceived influence in shaping the overall meaning of the text.’ (168). In determining the influence actors have on a text, Carvalho is primarily concerned with the ‘framing power’ of the actors, defined as: ‘the capacity of one actor to convey her/his views and positions through the media, by having them represented by journalists either in the form of quotes or regular text.’ (168). In literary journalism, however, actors do not have the same level of ‘framing power’ as they would in a conventional news article. One of the reasons for this is that a work of literary journalism takes months and often years to reach the market whereas a news article, in regard to the event that it reports, is usually only newsworthy for a limited period of time. Consequently, literary journalism does not appeal to the same type of actors who tend to be sought after by news journalists, that is, individuals that are prominent, newsworthy or ‘highly recognisable on a local, state, national, or international basis.’

This is not to suggest that literary journalists do not report on famous or influential people—Gay Talese, for instance, became renowned for his profiles on Frank Sinatra and the baseball player, Joe DiMaggio—simply that conventional journalists tend to actively seek out high profile individuals on account of their newsworthiness. However, conventional journalists ‘must not takes sides; must not reveal their personal bias, show favour, sympathy or antipathy...’ and this need for balance gives actors potential power and control if they are savvy with respect to their image and message. On the other hand, literary journalists are not subject to the same professional constraints and pressures and are therefore at greater liberty to observe, interpret and represent actors as they see fit, which greatly diminishes the actors’ capacity to influence the overall meaning of the text. Carvalho

asks: ‘Whose perspective seems to dominate? What is the “framing power” of the social actors in relation to the media?’ (186). A set of questions more suitable to literary journalism might be: Whose perspective seems to dominate? Why has this perspective been chosen? How are the actors represented? What impact does this have on the overall meaning of the text?

The fourth dimension is ‘Language, Grammar and Rhetoric’. According to Carvalho, ‘the identification of key concepts and of their relationship to wider ideological frameworks is an important part of discourse analysis.’ (168). Carvalho asserts that both the vocabulary used for representing a certain reality (e.g. verbs, adjectives or adverbs) and writing style (e.g. formal/informal, technical or conversational) are important for the way in which meanings are constituted. Carvalho explains that linguistic analysis (which encompasses pragmatics, semantics and syntax in discourse) is beyond the scope of her framework, which she limits to the study of concepts, vocabulary/lexical choices and style (168). However, her fourth dimension does involve paying close attention to ‘metaphors, other rhetorical figures and persuasive devices in the text.’ (169). For Carvalho, rhetorical analysis is important because an emotionally charged discourse appeals to the reader’s emotions (169). Ann Gill and Karen Whedbee also argue that rhetorical analysis plays an important role in discourse analysis because rhetoric can operate as a means of domination and oppression, and every ‘text, in focusing on some things, in making some things present to an audience, at one and the same time obscures something else.’

---

This notion of discourse being ‘adapted to its end’ \(^\text{169}\) is expanded in Carvalho’s fifth dimension, ‘Discursive Strategies,’ which constitute ‘forms of discursive manipulation of reality by social actors, including journalists, in order to achieve a certain effect or goal.’ (169). Carvalho states that the manipulation of reality is not necessarily an illegitimate alteration of reality but is simply a ‘discursive intervention’, defined by Antje Wiener as ‘social practices that entail and re/construct the meaning of norms…’ \(^\text{170}\) According to Carvalho, the reporter’s main intervention is ‘enacted in the selection of an angle of the (complex) reality s/he is talking about. This is an important aspect of “framing” a certain reality.’ (169). ‘Framing’ is the action of organising discourse according to a certain point of view or perspective and involves selection and composition. Selection refers to the reporter’s decisions regarding which facts, opinions, value judgements, and so forth, to include or exclude, while composition signifies the arrangement of these elements in order to produce a particular meaning. Carvalho argues that framing is unavoidable because it is ‘a necessary operation in talking about reality…[and]…what is at stake in the analysis of framing as a discursive strategy is \textit{how}, and not \textit{whether}, an actor frames reality.’ (169).

Carvalho’s sixth and final dimension is ‘Ideological Standpoints.’ She argues for ideology as an overarching textual aspect which is ‘embedded in the selection and representation of objects and actors, and in the language and discursive strategies employed in the text.’ (170). Ideological standpoints need to be identified based on relatively subtle mechanisms and devices; for instance, looking at ‘alternative constructions of the same reality (such as different media reports) is a helpful


strategy.’ (170-1). Carvalho does not view the analysis of discursive strategies and ideological standpoints in journalistic texts as being separate from the analysis of the other dimensions:

The discursive strategies of news professionals are implicated in the layout and structure of the text, in the construction of the objects and actors in discourse, and in the language, grammar and rhetoric…[and]…ideological positions have to be inferred from all the other elements, as well as the discursive strategies. (170)

As mentioned above, Carvalho’s methodological framework has been used in this thesis due to the pragmatic set of research strategies it offers. Even though only a few of these dimensions have been explicitly referred to in the close readings, all six have collectively informed and directed the analyses. This ensures that the referential link between the text and reality is not only recognised but also appropriately informs the close readings. Due to the design of the thesis, which is intended to give a sense of the range of the genre, the texts chosen for analysis are eclectic. Therefore, the methodology used to analyse these narratives needs to be broad enough to be universally applicable. Risto Kunelius’ model for analysing narrative voice has been used to supplement Carvalho’s CDA framework because it satisfies this requirement by focusing on different narrative ‘voices’ in journalism.

Kunelius’ model divides narrative voice into two dimensions: visibility and dependency. The visibility of the narrative voice (narration) is, at its extremes, either a ‘completely “faded”, abstract and anonymous voice…’171 (‘transparent’ narration) or clearly apparent due to ‘definite hints about the time, place, and context of the act of narration…’ (252) (‘identifiable’ narration). These two extremes are represented in RLJ and MLJ. The disguised perspective of RLJ, for instance, gives the impression that it is letting ‘the issues, events and people included in the narration present

171 Risto Kunelius, “Order and Interpretation: A Narrative Perspective on Journalistic Discourse,” European Journal of Communication, vol. 9, issue 4 (September 1994), 252. [All subsequent references in this chapter refer to this particular article].
themselves; it allows the “world” to explain itself.’ (252). Meanwhile, the admitted perspective of MLJ points to ‘a specific person, telling the story in a specific situation at a specific moment.’ (252). The second dimension of narrative voice, dependency, also has two extremes. At one end, the narrator is similar to that found in a traditional realistic novel (an ‘omniscient’ narrator) because it is ‘independent’ of the world it narrates, and is a narrative voice that ‘can be present when the characters are alone, that can move freely in time and space, that has access to the thoughts of its characters, etc....’ (252). At the other end of the scale, the narrator is ‘dependent’ on the world it narrates and merely repeats ‘the utterances (and thus the discourse) of the sources....’ (253)

Kunelius explains that this narratological approach distinguishes between the text’s ‘own’ voice and the ‘reported speech’ it mediates, differentiating the narrator’s and actor’s discourses (254). This approach suggests three kinds of participants: the narrator, the narratee, which is the audience to whom the narrator is addressing the narration, and the actors. Using a range of examples, Kunelius explains how the four narrative situations at the extreme ends of the transparent/identifiable and independent/dependent scales ‘imply different positions for the narratee involved in the textual communication.’ (259). The narratee’s role is dependent on how the narrative is presented. If the narrative is transparent-independent or identifiable-dependent, the narratee takes on the role of a spectator. Conversely, if the narrative is transparent-dependent or identifiable-independent, the narratee is addressed as a listener. Kunelius locates these two narratee roles on the following axis, which he calls ‘The Narrative ‘Force Field’:

---

If RLJ and MLJ were to be situated on ‘The Narrative ‘Force Field’’, RLJ would occupy the area above the horizontal axis while MLJ would occupy the area below the axis because the fundamental difference between RLJ and MLJ is the visibility of the narrator. However, both modes of literary journalism can display narrative dependency or independency, depending on how the narrative is framed. This means that, in both modes, the narratee can be addressed as either a spectator or listener.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the six primary texts analysed in this thesis have been chosen as a representative sample of the genre, and have been ordered and arranged in accordance with Eason’s typology and Webb’s continuum. The aim of this chapter has been to create a method for studying the unique characteristics of each text in detail. Carvalho’s CDA framework and Kunelius’ model for analysing narrative voice have been combined to provide a method for analysing nonfiction narrative, while ensuring that the close readings are informed by
CHAPTER 4: Method

key external sources of information. Both the framework and approach and method are put into practice in the following six analytical chapters.
PART II
REALIST LITERARY JOURNALISM
Homicide

John C. Hartsock argues that the ‘abstracting nature of factual or objective journalism…’\textsuperscript{173} involves the cognitive process of ‘volatilization’, which is ‘the tendency to essentialize or totalize distinctive phenomenal experiences into comprehensive abstract generalities by the exclusion of differences between those experiences…’\textsuperscript{174}. He explains that literary journalism is different from objective journalism because it ‘engages in a kind of reverse volatilization, or perhaps more appropriately a critical precipitation because of its focus on the concrete particular—scene construction and dialogue, for example—as applied to a certain time and place.’\textsuperscript{175} In the ‘Author’s Note’ of his book, Homicide, David Simon articulates his belief that an inverted-pyramid article structure is incapable of capturing anything but a shrunken semblance of reality (an abstract generality)—a discovery he made when working on the book, as he explains:

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:

A 22-year-old West Baltimore man was gunned down yesterday at an intersection near his home in an apparent drug-related incident. Detectives have no motive or suspects in the case, police said.
Anton Thompson, of the 1400 block of Stricker Street, was found by patrol officers called to the scene of…

Suddenly, I had been granted access to a world hidden, if not willfully ignored, by all of that dispassionate journalism. These weren’t murders as benchmarks of a day’s events. Nor were they the stuff of pristine, perfectly rendered morality plays…Perhaps, I told myself, it was the ordinariness of it all that made it, well, extraordinary.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{173} Hartsock, \textit{A History of American Literary Journalism}, 48.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{176} David Simon, \textit{Homicide: A Year On The Killing Streets} (Edinburgh: Canongate Books Ltd., 2008), 627. [All subsequent references in this chapter refer to this edition].
Simon reveals that leaving *The Baltimore Sun* to research and write *Homicide* made it possible for him to recognise that objective news articles were a rigidly prescribed form that depersonalised the events they covered, reducing ‘all human tragedy…to bland, bite-sized morsels…’ (627). Simon’s self-imposed exile from the news industry, and his time as an honorary police intern in the Baltimore homicide unit for the purposes of research, exposed him to a world that he had never fully understood or accurately portrayed before, even though he had worked closely with the police department during his four years working on the crime ‘beat’ for *The Baltimore Sun*. Simon had written to the Baltimore police commissioner, Edward J. Tilghman, asking for permission to observe his detectives for a year. To his surprise, Tilghman consented even though the captain in charge of the homicide unit, the deputy commissioner for operations, and most of the detectives in the department ‘thought it a terrible notion to allow a reporter into the unit.’ (627). Forced to cut his hair, remove a diamond-studded earring, and wear a sport coat, tie and formal trousers, Simon soon became ‘a piece of the furniture in the unit, a benign part of the detective’s scenery…’ (619), which gave him the freedom and exposure to more comprehensively understand police work—liberties he was denied as a conventional reporter.

*Homicide* is an example of immersion reporting. Simon spent twelve months observing the lives and activities of detectives in the Baltimore homicide squad. The book follows the development of several different investigations, alternating between them chapter by chapter, providing extremely detailed accounts of the different detectives as they strived to solve their cases, accompanied by long expository tracts explaining the dynamics and ethos of murder investigation. Simon reveals that he had

177 The word ‘beat’ is journalistic jargon for ‘the exclusive territory assigned to a reporter or a series of places visited by a reporter to gather news…’ V.S. Gupta, *Handbook of Reporting and Communication Skills* (New Delhi, India: Concept Publishing Company, 2003), 50.
no intention of judging the actions or attitudes of any of the detectives, wanting only to capture and represent the hard reality of what he witnessed. Although, ultimately, the only judgements that mattered to him ‘were those of the detectives…’ (637), Simon is not implying that he sought to ingratiate himself with these men (there were no female detectives represented in the text) to win their approval and acceptance; rather, he is suggesting that the only people capable of judging the accuracy of the book are the detectives themselves because they are the ones who actually experienced what is depicted in the narrative.

Richard Price describes *Homicide* as ‘a day in, day out journal…’\(^{178}\) that provides an enormous amount of information regarding the day-to-day work of detectives. This type of work received very little public attention before the release of *Homicide* and Simon was the first journalist in U.S. history to be given unrestricted access to a homicide department. Any exposure detective work had received was either based on fiction or written by untrained commentators much like Simon prior to his research—journalists working on the crime beat who had little real understanding of what police work actually involves. On several occasions throughout the book, Simon differentiates between ‘an ordinary person’, who is incapable of reading a crime scene, and a ‘good detective’, who ‘looks at the same scene and comprehends the pieces as part of a greater whole.’ (80). Simon takes it upon himself to highlight the various myths about police work, which have been produced and perpetuated by the plethora of crime stories within popular culture, and then systematically debunk them, as shown in the following example:

The detective’s trinity ignores motivation, which matters little to most investigations. The best work of Dashiell Hammett and Agatha Christie argues that to track a murderer, the motive must be first established; in Baltimore, if not on the Orient

Express, a known motive can be interesting, even helpful, yet it is beside the point. Fuck the why, a detective will tell you; find out the how, and nine times out of ten it’ll give you the who. (80)

If the detectives represented in *Homicide* were ever going to have faith in his work Simon would need to be extremely precise and accurate about every single factual detail, capturing exactly what the detective said, where he stood when he said it, what his tone and manner was at the time, who else was present in the room, what they were wearing, where they stood, what they said, how they acted, how the room was arranged and so on. But his task does not end there. Simon also has to identify and depict each detective’s idiosyncrasies, personality and social outlook—all without resorting to the same clichés and formulae that feed the socio-cultural misconceptions of U.S. law enforcement officers that he was trying to avoid.

Simon states that, ‘If…[the detectives]…read the book and pronounced it honest, I would not feel the shame that comes from snatching pieces of human lives and putting them on display for all to see.’ (637). This reveals the extent to which accuracy and honesty were more than mere professional requirements for Simon; they were also moral imperatives. Having such unrivalled access to the lives of these detectives—spending long periods of time in their company by following them day and night, sitting with them in the office waiting for the next call, fraternising with them in bars when the job was done—meant that Simon felt a personal debt to them that could only be repaid (at least in part) by his complete honesty. As he says: ‘What kind of journalist follows human beings for years on end, recording their best moments and their worst, without acquiring some basic regard for their individuality, their dignity, their value? I admit it. I love these guys.’ (638). *Homicide*, therefore, is not so much about the murders, or the police department, or the city, although these are of course important factors in the book. It is ultimately about the men who live
their lives as detectives, focusing not only on how they cope with the enormous physical and psychological demands of this type of work. At its heart, this book is a character study that is conducted by an inquisitive and faithful interpreter. *Homicide* has therefore been chosen as the first RLJ to be analysed because, of all the six texts studied in this thesis, it has been the most influenced by the objective ideals of rationalism and, as such, provides the ‘purest’ illustration of the RLJ mode.

*Homicide* perfectly illustrates why criminal investigations translate so well into story-form. For the detectives involved, each new case is a blank canvas. When a detective receives a call from dispatch, he must nominate a secondary investigator and determine who will accompany him to the crime scene; he must interview any potential witnesses, analyse the scene and its surroundings and speak to the local officers and crime scene technicians, all before returning to the office to file a report, and then proceed with the investigation. This routine masks the fact that each and every case poses a unique challenge for both primary and secondary detectives. Until they arrive on the scene, they have no idea who the victim is, who the assailant(s) is, what happened or why. They are required to process enormous amounts of information—from witnesses, potential suspects, arresting officers, forensic staff and so on—and determine which details are significant to the case and those they can filter out as irrelevant. The reader of the book is like the detective approaching the scene of the crime, with no prior knowledge of the principal figures involved, but trying to piece together what has happened. That is, the reader, is invited to replicate the detective’s cognitive procedure.

If Simon had written about these cases using an inverted pyramid article structure, he would have been forced to state who did what, to whom, and when, in a
summary lead,\textsuperscript{179} and would have been denied the opportunity of structuring the story to reflect the detectives’ original experience, or build any sort of suspense by delaying the denouement for the reader. As Jim Willis explains, literary journalism’s story structure differs from that of the inverted pyramid story structure because it begins with an anecdotal or scene-setting opening, instead of a summary lead, and ‘focuses on the individual character or characters within the story or details the setting of the story vividly.’\textsuperscript{180} By following the exact chronology of these cases using narrative form, Simon is able to epistemologically align the reader with the protagonist. The reader experiences the brutal and alien environment vicariously through the detective’s own experience, knowledge and expertise.

Although Simon uses several prominent literary devices to create his absorbing account of the murderous landscape of American urban society, the most prevalent is the third-person perspective (3rd PP), which is a technique of ‘presenting every scene to the reader through the eyes of a particular character…’\textsuperscript{181} 3rd PP is extremely effective for in-depth character studies because the narrative is structured around the protagonist’s experiential reality rather than the journalist’s. According to Tom Wolfe, first-person perspective (1st PP)—the normative point of view in narrative based journalism—is less effective than 3rd PP because it ‘is very limiting for the journalist…since he can bring the reader inside the mind of only one character—himself—a point of view that often proves irrelevant to the story and irritating to the reader.’\textsuperscript{182} 1st PP is incapable of conveying the internal, emotional lives of the actors because it restricts the journalist from presenting the narrative from

\textsuperscript{180} Willis, \textit{The Media Effect}, 90.
\textsuperscript{181} Wolfe, “The New Journalism,” 46.
\textsuperscript{182} Ibid., 47.
any other point of view apart from his or her own. However, 3rd PP allows the writer to present the narrative from an actor’s perspective, causing the narrative voice to become identified with the protagonist, as noted by James Woods:

As soon as someone tells a story about a character, narrative seems to want to bend itself around that character, wants to merge with that character, to take on his or her way of thinking and speaking.¹⁸³

According to Susan Ehrlich, this occurs because ‘the sensation adjectives in question can represent only a speaker’s experiencing of sensations and emotions, their occurrence with third-person subjects serves to invoke the third person’s point of view.’¹⁸⁴ In other words, since the writer is disguised in a transparent-independent narrative voice, his descriptions of the protagonist’s sensations and experiential reality appears to invoke the point of view of the actor, despite this being a contrivance. However, as William Guynn argues, in practice there are limits to what a journalist can legitimately depict in 3rd PP because ‘human thought in the internal, psychological sense can only be the result of a cautious analysis of information.’¹⁸⁵

One of the major advantages of 3rd PP is its capacity to focalize the narrative in ‘close third person.’¹⁸⁶ James Woods explains that close third person (CTP) takes effect when the narrator appears to ‘take on the properties of the character, who now seems to ‘own’ the words.’¹⁸⁷ Effectively, the narrator adopts the diction of the actor, copying his or her natural style of speech and making it hard to determine who is actually speaking—the narrator or the actor—as illustrated in this example:

Donald Waltemeyer is losing it. McLarney can tell because Waltemeyer’s eyes have begun to roll up into his forehead the way they always do when he gets steamed. McLarney worked with a guy in the Central who used to do that. Nicest guy in the world. Pretty long fuse. But let some yo with an attitude ride him too far, those eyeballs

¹⁸⁴ Susan Ehrlich, Point of View: A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style (London: Routledge, 1990), 5.
¹⁸⁵ William Guynn, Writing History in Film (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2006), 63.
¹⁸⁷ Ibid.
would roll up like an Atlantic City slot. It was a sure sign to every other cop that negotiations had ended and nightsticks were in order. McLarney tries to shrug off the memory; he continues to press the point with Waltemeyer. (627)

This passage is clearly written from the perspective of Detective Sergeant Terrence McLarney. Even though the first sentence is a declarative statement and not attributed to anyone, the next sentence indicates that McLarney is the person responsible for suggesting that Waltemeyer is ‘…losing it.’ The third sentence reveals that McLarney has previously experienced a similar situation before with another police officer who was also on the brink of ‘losing it’, which is why he can ‘tell’ Waltemeyer’s current mental state. The final four sentences describe McLarney’s memory of the other officer in Central in greater detail before the narrative returns to the present situation, where McLarney proceeds to shrug off the memory and ‘continues to press the point with Waltemeyer.’

The most noticeable feature of the middle section of this paragraph is that the narrative assumes the same gruff, muscular intonation and inflection as the language commonly used by officers in the Baltimore Police Department (BPD). For instance, ‘yo’—the term used for a lawless or antisocial black youth—is part of the local police vernacular, which is populated with other racially charged slurs, such as ‘yoette’ (the female equivalent of a ‘yo’) and ‘billie’, which denotes a ‘white-trash redneck’ (417) from the southern suburbs of the city. Simon is quick to point out that the BPD is replete with every colour and creed, which he believes proves that the discriminatory nature of their jargon is not racism per se but more akin to class-consciousness and ‘contempt for the huddled masses.’ (414).

Returning to the middle four sentences of this passage, a combination of quick-fire, staccato statements (‘Nicest guy in the world. Pretty long fuse…’); ellipsis (‘ride him too far, those eyeballs would roll…’)—a comma standing in for the
conjunction ‘and’); and colloquial synecdoche (‘negotiations had ended and nightsticks were in order…’—a euphemism for assault on a suspect) is used to replicate the colloquial language of the BPD. It is clear from the lack of quotation marks or other grammatical indicators signalling speech, that McLarney is not personally describing his own memory, rather it is the narrator describing it in McLarney’s idiom. This passage is an example of free indirect prose (FIP), an extremely useful tool for RLJ because the writer can benefit from ‘its potential for combining both distanced observation of a character and a sense of how he or she sees the world.’

A naïve reading of this passage might suggest that Simon is deceiving the reader because he suppresses his ‘autolingua’ (the inner voice of the storyteller) and assumes the implied voice of one of his actors. Yet, it is evident from the tone and context that Simon does this ironically, colourfully flaunting the narratorial contrivance and making it easy for the reader to know the dancer from the dance, to use Yeats’ expression. Simon’s playful elucidation of this artificial construction of reality means that the narrative is both self-reflexive and referential, revealing how RLJ is postmodern in both its style and technique.

The combination of objective, distanced observation and the focalization of an actor’s point of view using 3rd PP is consistently used throughout *Homicide*. As Hugh Kenner has noted in James Joyce’s writing, the normally neutral narrative vocabulary occasionally becomes ‘pervaded by a little cloud of idioms which a character might use if he were managing the narrative.’ This technique, which Kenner refers to as ‘The Uncle Charles Principle, entails writing about someone much as that someone

---

would choose to be written about.\textsuperscript{192} The Uncle Charles Principle is closely related to free indirect prose (FIP) and does not entail recording spoken words but it can extend from diction to syntax. These techniques, which can be conceived as different methods of close third person (CTP), allow Simon to overcome the visual and psychological limitations of omniscient and first person narration and present the narrative as if looking through the character’s eyes\textsuperscript{193} because focal point of the narrative switches from the narrator to the actor, offering ‘new values, new appreciations…[and]…new imaginative apprehensions….’\textsuperscript{194}

In preface to his novel, \textit{The Wings of a Dove}, Henry James said that, by selecting and fixing on a particular character, an author could establish ‘successive centres’ throughout the narrative; and the chosen subject on which the narrative converges would possess the ‘weight and mass and carrying power’\textsuperscript{195} of the entire scene. Melvin J. Friedman notes that Truman Capote used this technique in \textit{In Cold Blood}, skilfully manipulating point of view ‘to present the events through as many eyes as possible.’\textsuperscript{196} John Hollowell has argued that this technique ‘allowed Capote to maintain an illusion of objectivity, since he scrupulously avoided direct comment or evaluation in his speaking voice.’\textsuperscript{197} Although his narrator feels less like a ‘clinical diagnostician’\textsuperscript{198} than Capote’s, Simon also painstakingly excludes, ‘except by
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implication, his own story, the entire story of his engagement and involvement...’199 which is consistent with the assumption in RLJ that ‘observing is a passive act entailing no existential responsibility.’200

Erasing oneself from a story requires a careful and consistent subterfuge. Although Simon was present and party to the events depicted in *Homicide*, the text itself bears no sign of his presence and he is never referred to. As a result, it is often hard to determine who exactly is addressing the reader, especially when CTP is in full effect. Gérard Genette has devised a taxonomy of fictional/factual narratives that identifies three principal elements: author (A), narrator (N) and character (C). Genette schematises narrative nonfiction with the formula: \( A = N \), and fiction with the formula: \( A \neq N \).201 According to this formulation, then, the narrator and author are the same in narrative nonfiction. Yet, Marie-Laure Ryan warns that the narrator in nonfiction should not be conceptualised as ‘an ad hoc theoretical construct added on to the author-parameter for the sole purpose of distinguishing fiction from nonfiction, for if this were the case we could greatly simplify matters by stating that nonfiction is narrated by an A and fiction by an N.’202

*Homicide* adds weight to Ryan’s argument because the narrator is heterodiegetic: it is ‘alien (hetero-) to the world of the stories...’203. This reveals a dissonance between Simon, the actual person ‘out there’ in reality, and the narrator because it is impossible for Simon to be ‘alien’ to the world depicted in the text because he was immersed in this environment when the events took place. His

---

201 Gérard Genette, Nitsa Ben-Ari, and Brian McHale, “Fictional Narrative, Factual Narrative,” *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 4, Narratology Revisited II (Winter 1990), 766.
participation, albeit only as a witness, places a referential constraint on him solely residing on the extradiegetic level, as the narrator does. However, even though Simon and the narrator are separate entities, they do have a symbiotic relationship. Simon has created a narrator that provides external focalization in order to observe the actions and behaviour of the actors in 3rd PP. However, he must ensure that the assertions made in the narrative are true and cannot grant ‘any autonomy to any narrator.’

It is also clear that Simon is not a ‘character’ (to use Genette’s term) because there is no trace of him within the spatiotemporal universe of the diegesis. In respect to Genette’s triadic model of narration, *Homicide’s* formula would be:

According to this conception, *Homicide* would be categorised as heterodiegetic fiction, revealing a serious flaw in Genette’s taxonomy. Dorrit Cohn has stated that the distinction between the two levels of analysis commonly labelled as ‘story’ and ‘discourse’ has traditionally ‘functioned as the initiating and enabling move of all major narratological studies…’ In respect to narrative nonfiction, Cohn argues that this text-orientated dichotomous model fails to adequately address ‘the referential level (or data base).’ To remedy this fundamental problem in narratology, Cohn proposes adding a level of reference to create a tri-level model (reference/story/discourse) of historical discourse that ‘introduces a diachronic

---
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dimension...that is absent from the bi-level model of fictional narrative.  

Cohn’s model enables literary journalism theorists to assess the ‘all-important temporal corollary...’ in texts, which means they are not restricted to the synchronic relationship of ‘story’ and ‘discourse’ and can consider, for instance, how the reporter has integrated documentary evidence, or how the past has been interpreted in the narrative. In essence, Cohn’s tri-model takes external reality into account when analysing the narrative, and reveals not only why Homicide has an inherent tension in its narrativity but also what action Simon takes to address it, which is illustrated in the following example:

Pellegrini knows, too, that soon he will have a separate suspect file on the new witness as well. Not only because the willingness to implicate someone in a child killing is unusual behavior, but because the new man himself knows the Reservoir Hill area and has a police record. For rape. With a knife. Nothing, Pellegrini tells himself, is ever easy.

Closing the file with the office reports, Pellegrini reads through a draft report of his own, a four-page missive to the captain outlining the status of the case and arguing for a complete, prolonged review of the existing evidence. Without any primary crime scene or physical evidence, the report argued, there wasn’t much point in looking at any particular suspect and then attempting to connect him to the murder.

“This tactic might be successful in certain circumstances,” Pellegrini had written, “but not in the case where physical evidence is lacking.”

Instead the memo urged a careful review of the entire file:

Since the collections of that data was accomplished by no less than twenty detail officers and detectives, it is reasonable to believe that a significant piece of information may exist, but has not yet been developed. It is the intent of your investigator to limit the number of investigators to the primary and secondary detectives.

In simple terms, Pellegrini wants more time to work the case and he wants to work it alone. His report to the captain is clear, yet bureaucratic; generally succinct, yet written in the departmental prose that makes anyone with a rank higher than lieutenant feel warm and fuzzy all over. Still, it could be better, and if he is going to get time to review the case properly, the captain will have to be on board.

Pellegrini pulls the staple from the top of the page and threads the draft on his desk... (246-7)

The first paragraph of this section is written in CTP: the narrator states what Pellegrini ‘knows’, and, as if to confirm that Pellegrini’s thoughts are unspoken, the

---
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paragraph ends with the clause: ‘Pellegrini tells himself’—emphasising the fact that this is Pellegrini’s internal perspective that is being represented. The second paragraph switches from Pellegrini’s thoughts to a remove indicative of the distant observation of a character (DOC). Pellegrini is described ‘Closing the file with the office reports’ before he begins reading his own draft report. The narrator then examines this report and a brief summary is provided. Then the report is paraphrased in the second sentence of paragraph two, briefly quoted, and paraphrased again at the end of the fourth paragraph. Paragraph five supplements this summary with a synopsis of the report’s objectives, followed by a brief textual analysis and evaluation of its prose and content. Finally, in the last paragraph, the narrative returns to DOC, with Pellegrini de-stapling the document and threading the pages together.

The DOC in the second and final paragraph proves that Simon personally witnessed Pellegrini handling his report at this desk. However, Simon could only have found out Pellegrini’s thoughts—provided in CTP—by speaking to him afterwards. Simon explains in the ‘Author’s Note’ that whenever a character is shown to be thinking something, ‘it is not mere presumption: In every case, subsequent actions made those thoughts apparent or I discussed the matter with that person afterward.’ (620). Although it is not clear from the text which thoughts were ‘apparent’ from subsequent actions and which were divulged in later discussions, it is reasonable to assume that on this particular occasion Simon interviewed Pellegrini afterwards because reading is (generally) an outwardly inexpressive activity, and Simon would not have been able to gauge Pellegrini’s thoughts by simply observing him. Therefore, working on the assumption that Simon both witnessed Pellegrini reading and interviewed him afterwards, an analysis of the tense shift in this passage will
show how Simon implants extraneous information into this scene without drawing
attention to it.

To begin with, the CTP representation of Pellegrini’s internal perspective in
paragraph one is composed in the simple present tense (‘Pellegrini knows…’ and
‘Nothing, Pellegrini tells himself, is ever easy…’); as are his actions in the DOC in
paragraph two, which are initially non-finite (‘Closing the file with the office
reports…’), but are linked via the logical connection between the clauses to
‘Pellegrini reads…’ in the simple present tense. Using the present tense for both the
CTP and DOC, means that both of these perspectives are manifested simultaneously
in the narrative transmission of this scene. On one level, representing Simon’s
external perspective of Pellegrini and Pellegrini’s own internal perspective together in
this way can be justified on the grounds that Pellegrini’s thoughts and actions were
concurrent in reality. Yet, on another level, melding the two perspectives together—
Simon’s (in DOC) and Pellegrini’s (in CTP)—produces an ulterior perspective; one
that does not correspond directly with either Simon’s or Pellegrini’s experience of this
event. Simon could not have known what Pellegrini was thinking at the time and
Pellegrini could not have observed himself at a distance. Ultimately, the information
used in this scene is factual, but the perspective used to present it is a contrivance with
a questionable ontological status. Amalgamating two separate perspectives into the
one using third-person narrative forces Simon to adopt a heterodiegetic system that is
ultimately artificial because the perspective it uses (the narrator’s) is metemperical—
it ‘extends beyond our common experience…’\textsuperscript{210} of reality.

\textsuperscript{210} Herbert James Patterson, \textit{Kant’s Metaphysics of Experience}, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 2002),
256.
The rhetorical nature of paragraph six is more conspicuous. Typographically separated from the preceding paragraphs and the opening caveat (‘In simple terms…’), it clearly signals a different perspective and that the report’s summary is now being interpreted and explained by the narrator. Predictably, the tense changes again, from the past perfect to the present continuous, enabling the narrator to explicate what Pellegrini wants (in the future) to result from his report, before returning once again to the simple present tense for the analysis of the report’s prose.

The use of the present tense in this analytical section of paragraph six—starting: ‘His report to the captain is clear…’—belies the implausibility of the situation. On closer inspection, the narrator is said to be analysing a document which is, according to the final clause in the passage, currently being handled by Pellegrini, who is de-stapling it and spreading it across his desk. It is reasonable to assume that Pellegrini’s possession of the report precludes the narrator’s ability to read it at the same time. This leaves only one other option: Simon examined the document on a separate occasion and not—as it is presented—at the time of this scene. Of course, care must be taken not to overstate or be too critical about the rhetorical strategies discovered in this passage because the transparent-independent voice makes it clear that Pellegrini is not addressing the audience, unlike the case when FIP is utilised. It is perfectly acceptable and common for RLJ writers to interject scenes with bits of information for the purposes of context or clarity, without having to state where that information came from, or justify why it is being included. W. Ross Winterowd invokes H.P. Grice’s ‘Cooperative Principle’ to postulate guidelines for the writer-reader contract in what he calls the ‘literature of fact’:

The author tacitly promises (1) to give the readers all they need to know and nothing in excess (the maxim of quantity); (2) to be reliable and truthful (the maxim of quality);
(3) not to introduce irrelevancies (the maxim of relation); and (4) to be as clear as possible (the maxim of manner). 211

Simon would argue that a comprehensive explanation of how and when he analysed the report or found out what Pellegrini was thinking at the time would be unnecessary and excessive, thereby breaking the maxims of quantity and relation, respectively. Including such incidental information would also appear at odds with the scene itself, affecting the maxim of manner. It is likely that Simon would also argue that, irrespective of the constitution and configuration of this scene, everything is reliable and true, thereby honouring the maxim of quality. The manipulation of tense and perspective is undeniably a strategy Simon employs so as to covertly insert information into a scene without having to elaborate on its source or reveal his presence. Essentially, what Simon has done is to shift or displace the temporal perspective of the narrative so that there is little ‘distinction between viewing time and speaking time with respect to a given event, between when one sees (mentally) and when one says, even when seer and sayer coincide.’ 212 This allows two ontologically separate events—Simon’s analysis of the report and Pellegrini’s reading of the report at his desk—to be fused in the ‘NOW anchoring point or point of reference of the telling...’ 213 so that they are experienced as one, in a single narrative instance.

_Homicide_ uses externally verifiable pieces of information, such as police reports, case files, and public records, which constantly lend credibility to the narrative but also link it to the outside world. This makes it consistent with Lars Ole Sauerberg’s definition of documentary realism because it ‘does not violate the kind(s)

211 Winterowd, _The Rhetoric of the "Other" Literature_, 33.
of discourse conventionally used for the communication of fact but which, in contrast to traditional realism, relates verifiable events and/or figures.\textsuperscript{214} However, according to Sauerberg, a text’s documentary elements cannot be considered in isolation from the conditions of their manifestations in the individual work:

It may be assumed, however, that since the general signals from a text as a whole make for a bias in favour of literary function, the appearance of the documentary elements has the effect of thus being deliberately and insistingly foregrounded against the fictional function. The reader’s reactions, stemming from his sense of unease at not being able to orient himself definitively in relation to function by an unambiguous emission of text signals, will, again depending on the nature of the individual work, be a matter of the extent to which he is able to reconcile the documentary element with the fictional context.\textsuperscript{215}

When Sauerberg mentions the ‘fictional context’ or ‘fictional function’ of documentary realism, he is not referring to fiction as a product of the imagination per se, but rather the way in which factual or documentary material has been ‘processed and moulded into dramatic form by the author.’\textsuperscript{216} The more processed and moulded the information is, the greater the fictional function of the text and the less correspondence it has with reality. Conversely, if documentary material is not seamlessly embedded into the narrative then it becomes foregrounded in the text. In regard to \textit{Homicide}, Simon’s decision to hide how he obtained particular documentary elements pertinent to the scene with Pellegrini at his desk, but not strictly part of it (such as the information obtained from his own analyses and interviews), was made so that these elements would not be foregrounded against the dramatic form of the narrative.

Presumably, Simon wants his scenes to have ‘endophoric’ movement, directing ‘the reader’s attention inward to the narrative for information rather than

\textsuperscript{215} Sauerberg, \textit{Fact Into Fiction}, 6.
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid., 22.
outward.’217 Without endophoric movement, the extraneousness of the various documentary elements would be all too apparent to the reader, disturbing the reading process and causing a breakdown in the ‘temporal-causal chain of narrative progression.’218 This type of breakdown would have occurred, for example, had Simon chosen to use the simple present tense for the report’s analysis and the preterite for Pellegrini’s actions, because it would have highlighted the temporal difference between the two events. Although this would theoretically be more factually accurate, without a clear and full explanation of the sequence of events that took place in reality, changing the tenses of the clauses would be confusing and inexplicable, and the reading experience of *Homicide* would suffer as a consequence.

Uri Margolin explains that ‘one of the constitutive rules or conventions of fiction writing and reading alike is that the textual speaker on the highest level of embedding (the global narrator) is not to be identified with the actual author as regards person, time, and space.’219 Indeed, it was only by analysing the referential level of the passage above using Cohn’s tri-model of nonfiction narratives, that it became clear that the internal anchoring point of the narrative telling does not always correlate to the actual sequences of events. This leads to a tension in the text’s narrativity—between the endophoric movement of its dramatic form and the exophoric movement of the scene’s extraneous documentary elements. As with fiction, a RLJ narrator is not to be identified with the actual author in respect to person, time and space, despite RLJ having a closer relationship to the real than MLJ.

In more conventional forms of factual writing, such as in personal accounts written in 1st PP or historical writing, the narrator is the *prima facie* author based on the

assumption that nonfiction is narrated by an author and fiction by a narrator, as noted above by Marie-Laure Ryan. It is evident from *Homicide* that this conception of the narrator/author relationship in literary journalism needs to be reassessed. Lucie Guillemette and Cynthia Lévesque have noted that Genette himself said that ‘all narrative is necessarily diegesis (telling), in that it can attain no more than an illusion of mimesis (showing) by making the story real and alive.’²²⁰ That is, without a narrator, there can be no narrative. However, the co-dependency between reporter and narrator in RLJ makes it a unique form of factual writing. To use Margolin’s terminology, the realist reporter (the actual person ‘out there’ in reality) is both seer and doer. Simon, for instance, researched and investigated the story for the book: he witnessed and experienced the events depicted in the narrative; interviewed all of the necessary parties; and then constructed a narrative from all of the information he compiled during this process. The narrator, on the other hand, is simply the sayer: a figural device, or avatar, created and controlled by Simon to communicate the story on his behalf.

David Lodge reveals how Henry James disliked first-person narration in full-scale novels but favoured it for short stories because he felt that these narrators ‘are usually reporters of some enigmatic behaviour in other people, and the narrator’s consciousness is used as a convenient way to select and reflect on lives that, if presented from within, would require much more textual space.’²²¹ RLJ books are relatively scarce compared to the more personal forms of journalism because it takes longer to research and write these types of texts; the writers cannot simply describe what they saw, they have to find out exactly what happened from the actors’

---

perspectives. Ultimately, however, RLJ would not be possible without a sovereign narrator that provides these writers with the means to escape the limitations of their own perspectives. The narrator is essentially Simon’s avatar, which enables him to utilise a cache of literary mechanisms, such as authorial omniscience and bi-focal DOC/CTP so that he can objectively depict not only the chain of events during his time in the BPD but also convey the internal perspective of the actors at that time.

However, 3rd PP is not the only narratorial point of view used in *Homicide*; the other is second-person perspective (2nd PP). Simon uses 2nd PP to invite the reader to actively take part in imagining life as a criminal snared by the criminal justice system, or as a detective desperately trying in vain to catch a child-killer. Discussing the emotional cost of immersion reporting in relation to *Homicide*, Richard Price observes that, ‘But whoever allows us to walk a mile in their shoes, on either side of the law, we do feel an unavoidable empathy…’\(^{222}\). Empathy, Suzanne Keen explains, is ‘a vicarious, spontaneous sharing of affect…[that]…can be provoked by witnessing another emotional state, by hearing another’s condition, or even by reading.’\(^{223}\) By using 2nd PP, Simon not only wants the audience to understand what happened, who was involved, and why, but also wants his readers to experience what it is like to actually be one of the actors in the diegesis and to potentially empathise with them by sharing in the emotional turmoil of their situation. Essentially, Simon uses 2nd PP so that the reader can inhabit the intense emotional world of an actor, as illustrated in this example:

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31

They own you.

---


From the moment you thought the thought, you were their property. You don’t believe it; hell, you didn’t even imagine it. You were sure they’d never catch you, sure you could draw heart’s blood twice and just walk away. But you should have saved yourself some trouble, called 911 yourself. Right from the start, you were a gift.

But hey, it looked like a move when you made it, didn’t it now? You got Ronnie in the back bedroom, stuck him good in a dozen places with that kitchen blade before you knew what was what. Ronnie did some screaming, but his brother didn’t hear a thing with that box beat going so loud in the other bedroom. Yeah, you had Ronnie all to yourself, and when you came down the hallway toward the other bedroom, you figured Ronnie’s brother deserved more of the same. The boy was still in bed when you walked in on him, looking up at the blade he didn’t know what it was for...

But no, you’re still right here, staring at your killing hand. You fucked it up, cut the hand bad when Ronnie was oozing life and your life got wet and slippery...

You don’t know it, but you were theirs when they came in early to relieve the Friday overnight shift...They hadn’t changed the coffeepot when the phone rang, and it was the older one, the white-haired police, who scrawled out the particulars on a used pawn shop card. A Double, the dispatcher told them, so all three decided to ride up to Pimlico to look over your handiwork.

To the pale, dark-haired Italian, the younger one, you’re a blessing. He works your crime scene the way he wishes he had worked another...

You’re about to become property of the other one, too, the bear of a police with the white hair and the blue eyes...The Big Man began this year in a hole and then clawed his way out, so it’s your bad luck to be on the wrong side of the curve.

And don’t forget the sergeant, the joker in the leather jacket, who’s been riding a streak since October...He takes it personal, declaring that there is no way in hell his squad will end the year with an open double.

Here’s the morning line, bunk: The three of them have their hooks into you deep and they haven’t even met you yet...They’re working back on the Fullard brothers, learning who they hang out with and who hangs out with them. They got your number good. (601-2)

Matt DelConte has defined second-person narration as ‘a narrative mode in which a narrator tells a story to a (sometimes undefined, shifting, and/or hypothetical) narratee—delineated by you—who is also the (sometimes undefined, shifting, and/or hypothetical) principal actant in that story.’ In this passage, the narrator is addressing a narratee (understood as the actual audience), who also happens to be a principle ‘actant’—or actor, to use the correct terminology for RLJ. Essentially, the

---
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pronoun ‘you’ addresses both an intrinsic, textual ‘you’ (a narratee-actor) and an extrinsic, extratextual ‘you’ (a flesh-and-blood reader).\(^{226}\)

DelConte proposes a tri-level narrative model that corresponds to the traditional rhetorical model of speaker, text and audience, using these terms: narrator (\(N\)), protagonist (\(P\)) and narratee (\(N\)-tee). According to DelConte, his model is able to distinguish between first-, second- and third-person narrations better than other theories based solely on the single variable of ‘voice/speaker’.\(^{227}\) Introducing narratee into the equation, *Homicide*’s second-, and third-person narrative sections would have the following formulae:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{2}\text{nd PP} & \quad \text{3}\text{rd PP} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{N-tee} \\
\text{P}
\end{array} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{N-tee} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]
\]

In 3\text{rd PP}, the narrator, narratee, and protagonist have discrete functions, and the narratee equates solely to a flesh-and-blood reader. In 2\text{nd PP}, however, the narratee is split in two and is intradiegetic and extradiegetic—inside and outside the text—both reader and actor. This fits DelConte’s category of ‘Partially-Coincident Narration’ because there is a ‘coincidence of narratee and protagonist but a distinct narrator: a narrator speaks to an external narratee who is also the main actor.’\(^{228}\) It is important to note here that the reader is an extradiegetic-narratee and not a heterodiegetic-narratee as they are outside of the diegesis (looking in) but are not alien to the environment, as the narrator is. However, the relationship between the extradiegetic-narratee and the

\(^{228}\) Ibid., 212.
narratee-protagonist is similar to Simon’s relationship with the heterodiegetic narrator because on both occasions Simon has used a narratorial device (either a narrator or protagonist) to act as a gateway for a flesh-and-blood person (either himself or the reader) to encroach upon the narrative world.

‘Partially-Coincident Narration’ is an appropriate title for second-person narrative because, as James Phelan explains, the reader ‘will simultaneously occupy the positions of addressee and observer.’\textsuperscript{229} The passage above illustrates this partial coincidence. Although the pronoun ‘you’ automatically marks the reader as an addressee, the characterisation of ‘you’ is clearly a criminal, causing the narratee-reader to disassociate ‘from “you” and regard [the criminal] as a person “out there” being addressed by the narrator.’\textsuperscript{230} The audience is only partially implicated in 2\textsuperscript{nd} PP, even though it is addressed directly and observes (and experiences) life as the criminal in the diegesis. The reader’s role of observer in 2\textsuperscript{nd} PP is vastly different to their observer role in 3\textsuperscript{rd} PP because they are required to become much more involved, taking on the role of protagonist rather than passively observing an actor at a remove.

In the passage above, the criminal (‘you’) is in the process of being caught and charged with murder by Detective Sergeant Jay Landsman and Detectives Tom Pellegrini and Donald Worden. These investigators are the ‘three’ who respond to dispatch and work the crime scene together. The narrator reveals the identities of the three men through telling descriptive details: ‘the pale, dark-haired Italian’ (Pellegrini), ‘the Big Man’ (Worden) and ‘the sergeant, the joker in the leather jacket’ (Landsman). Simon’s use of synecdoche is consistent with the actual circumstances

\textsuperscript{229} Phelan, “Self-Help for narratee and narrative audience,” 352.
\textsuperscript{230} Ibid., 357.
because the intradiegetic ‘you’ (the criminal) would have had no idea who these three men were, addressing the detectives by name would have been inaccurate in respect to this particular point of view. However, the extradiegetic ‘you’ (the reader) already has intimate knowledge of the principal figures in the book and is able to identify them from these clues, which means that Simon does not have to misrepresent reality.

From the opening clause (‘They own you...’) to the last (‘They got your number good…’) the narration is heavily stylised with a sardonic, hostile sense of irony that is consistent with the perpetrator’s idiom. For instance, the crime itself is described with an aggravated disdain that borders on contempt: ‘Yeah, you had Ronnie all to yourself, and when you came down the hallway…you figured Ronnie’s brother deserved some of the same.’ The narrator’s choice of expression (‘you had Ronnie all to yourself…’ has rhetorical implications because it implies that the ‘you’ (the criminal) indulged in the act of killing with no qualms in committing the act. Moreover, the narrator’s claim that ‘you’ (the criminal) ‘figured Ronnie’s brother deserved more of the same…’ infers that the narratee committed the second killing on a whim as he was passing by, perhaps for the thrill of it. Whether this is true or not, the narrator’s rage and hatred for ‘you’ drives the momentum of the passage. The narratee is sneered at for being foolish, hapless and irrevocably doomed. All his efforts at evading capture are ridiculed due to their ineptitude; the killer is ‘a gift’ and ‘a blessing’ for the detectives, and ‘theirs when they came in early to relieve the Friday overnight shift…’. The detectives are portrayed as the exact opposite, as being at the top of their professional game: efficient, unified and unerringly committed. Pellegrini works the crime scene, ‘the way he wishes he had worked another…’; it is the killer’s ‘bad luck’ that Worden is currently on a hot streak; and Landsman is said
to be taking ‘it personal’ and is highly motivated, refusing to end the year with an ‘open double.’

Even though 2nd PP has been used in this passage to allow the reader to experience the sensation of being a killer about to be caught for his crimes, oblivious to the power and expertise of the homicide squad closing in on its target, the narrator’s stance towards the narratee-protagonist actively dissuades the audience from having any sympathy towards this actor. In other words, rather than using 2nd PP to strike an accord between the audience and the intradiegetic-narratee, Simon has applied it in order to express his disgust for the criminal and his crime. The reader, as addressee, is subjected to the full force of Simon’s revulsion, and made to relive the murder while knowing that the criminal will face justice for this act. However, this imaginative role is enjoyable for the reader because the dual perspective of addressee/observer role enables him or her to be simultaneously ‘in character’ but still aware that this is happening to someone else. In this way, the reader can assume the role of the criminal, look through his eyes, re-live his experiences and revel in the narrator’s acerbic wit, all the while knowing that ‘you’ are not him.

Simon’s use of 2nd PP in *Homicide* can be explained using the following diagram:

![Diagram](image)

The dotted vertical line in the middle of the diagram separates external reality from the textually created world of the diegesis. Simon (A) uses a heterodiegetic narrator
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(N) to address the reader (R) and the character/protagonist (C/P) simultaneously using the pronoun ‘you’. This creates a ‘partially-coincident’ narrative wherein the reader is both addressee (inside the diegesis) and observer (in reality) and ‘re-centers imaginatively into the time and space of the textually projected nonactual world and consequently pretends (makes believes, feels as if) he or she is inside this represented domain, experiencing its states and events as they are occurring.’

In order to construct the narrative in 2nd PP, Simon needed to re-create, or perhaps more accurately, re-imagine the circumstances from the criminal’s point of view. A level of artifice is involved in this process because it is unlikely that Simon would have been able to interview the criminal, who was, at the time, a prime suspect in an on-going murder investigation. Simon makes it clear that the intradiegetic-narratee is an actual suspect called David Wilson (606) ‘out there’ in reality, which rules out the possibility that the passage above is a hypothetical situation where the reader is invited to inhabit the emotional world of a fictional but plausible character. Therefore, the information provided by the narrator must be taken as fact. This begs the question: how could Simon have known that Wilson was so sure he would never be caught? Without asking Wilson or Simon personally, there is no reliable way of knowing the answer to this question. This highlights that, because of the way that documentary elements are often obscured by being embedded and incorporated into the framework of the narrative, literary techniques require a level of faith from the reader that the writer is in fact honouring the writer-reader contract. Also, Sauerberg argues that the main difference between a fictional narrative and a factual narrative is the ‘extent of free play allowed in the reader’s imaginative interaction with the

---

Inviting the audience to become involved in a murderer’s experiential reality should be regarded as a significant amount of free play for the reader in a factual narrative, indicating that more research is needed to understand how narrative techniques affect claims to facticity.

Ultimately, all of the different literary devices that have been analysed in this chapter, such as 2nd PP and the various techniques of CTP, illustrate how RLJ attempts to close the epistemological gulf between the reader and the hypothetically objectified world that is widened in conventional newswriting. That is, the goal of objective news writing is for the reporter to be completely detached, to effectively eliminate his or her own opinions, and to report just the facts, which blocks the reader from having any subjective understanding of that which is reported about. RLJ exhibits a complex relationship with subjectivity in combining a rationalist aesthetic with a romantic ideal but, as George Levine has noted in relation to other realist forms of writing, ‘No writer attempting to reach beyond words can fail to be struck by the work words do and cannot do, and therefore no such writer can fail to recognize the degree to which the creation of illusion is essential in the realist process.’ Simon’s efforts in copying McLarney’s manner of speech using FIP, the metemperical narratorial perspective he produces by combining CTP and DOC, as well as his aggressive narratorial persona and interaction with the audience when narrating in 2nd PP, make it unlikely that he did not recognise the degree to which the creation of illusion is essential in the realist process. Even though Simon’s engagement with

---

reality is not explicitly self-conscious, his methods and techniques prove that he is not only aware but acknowledges his continual shaping presence in the narrative, illustrating that ‘This so-called objectivity is, in fact, a form of subjectivity in disguise.’

---

In *Writing History, Writing Trauma*, Dominick LaCapra distinguishes between two approaches to historiography. In the first approach, ‘documentary’, ‘gathering evidence and making referential statements in the form of truth claims based on that evidence constitute necessary and sufficient conditions of historiography.’ LaCapra explains that this approach to history was especially prominent in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and may have been an attempt ‘to professionalise history under the banner of objectivity and to distance, if not disassociate, it from literature…’

The second, and opposing, approach to historiography is ‘radical constructivism’, which contends that truth-claims only apply to events that are of restricted or marginal importance and considers essential the ‘performative, figurative, aesthetic, rhetorical, ideological, and political factors that “construct” structures—stories, plots, arguments, interpretations, explanations—in which referential statements are embedded and take on meaning and significance.’ According to LaCapra, radical constructivism gained traction after the Holocaust when historians had difficulty conceptualising this historical event using the documentary approach, as revealed by Raul Hilberg, who writes:

…this is a cause of some worry, for we historians usurp history precisely when we are successful in our work, that is to say that nowadays some people might read what I have written in the mistaken belief that here, on my pages, they will find the true ultimate Holocaust as it really happened.

---
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Hilberg’s comments infer that society has a tendency to mistake an account of the past with the past itself, thereby failing to recognise that ‘the historian’s discourse is something quite other than the referent about which it speaks; it is…a discursive event that differs in both form and content from other kinds of events…by virtue of its status as a verbal performance.’\textsuperscript{242} The term ‘history’ is polysemous, functioning in the English language as a substantive noun (stipulating a literal or inviolable ‘past’) as well as an abstract noun (referring to the empirical study of historical research). This reflects and perhaps contributes to the confusion to which Hilberg refers.

Because the Holocaust is a relatively recent event, historians have access to a substantial amount of documentary material about it, which allows them to determine why it occurred and how it was politically justified, designed, organised, funded, managed, and so on. LaCapra argues that this wealth of historical data has provided historians with the necessary and sufficient conditions for making referential statements concerning the exact details of the Holocaust. However, LaCapra also suggests that historians have failed to capture the socio-psychological meaning and significance of this event, and according to this view, the Holocaust—an event symptomatic of an ‘almost total, moral collapse of an advanced industrial society…’\textsuperscript{243}—has, and will, remain known ‘only insofar as it has continued to exist in the present.’\textsuperscript{244}

Using an approach akin to radical constructivism, \textit{Schindler’s Ark} is Thomas Keneally’s attempt at retrieving the Holocaust from the past and capturing its socio-psychological meaning and signification by conveying the experiential and emotional lives of a group of Jewish men, women and children called the \textit{Schindlerjuden}, who
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survived under the care of the German industrialist Oskar Schindler. Keneally is
deliberate and conscientious with his sources and material, alerting the reader to any
contentious factual details, conflicting reports or eyewitness accounts. Naturally, this
affects the reader’s immersion in the narrative world as the narrative voice switches
from the transparent to the identifiable, drawing attention to the person telling the
story. Of course, as one of the fundamental characteristics of RLJ is its transparent
narrative voice, Keneally’s interjections could be regarded as incongruent with this
mode of literary journalism. However, Keneally only addresses the reader directly in
the spirit of sound historical practice, with a view to remaining impartial and
scrupulous in respect to the truth. Schindler’s Ark is a work of RLJ because the text is
‘organized around naturalizing discrepant views of reality within its own narrative
conventions.’ 245 Nonetheless, parts of this text are expository, so it is not as
consistently ‘objective’ in its style and structure as Homicide, and therefore sits
slightly more towards the middle on Webb’s continuum.

Tim Cole, in his analysis of three emblematic figures of the Holocaust—Anne
Frank, Adolf Eichmann and Oskar Schindler—has noted that it was not until Steven
Spielberg bought the rights to Schindler’s Ark and created the film adaptation
Schindler’s List in 1994, that Oskar Schindler received global recognition for his
humanitarian efforts during the Holocaust. According to Cole, Spielberg was the first
person to make ‘Schindler into not just a hero, but something of a saint…a Christ-like
figure.’ 246 Yet, it was Thomas Keneally who originally reified Schindler as a Christ-
like figure, no doubt inspired and influenced by the testimony of the Schindlerjuden

themselves—many of whom he personally met and interviewed during the course of his research for the book.

As noted in Chapter 4 of this thesis, Anabela Carvalho argues that the ‘surface’ elements of media texts ‘say something about the valuation and categorization of the issue…with implications for audience perception.’

Schindler’s Ark is no different, and Keneally’s title clearly expresses how Oskar Schindler’s life is valued and categorised in the text. Keneally explains that, just before Schindler’s Ark was due to be published in the United States, he attended a meeting with Dan Green, head of publishing at Simon & Schuster, who raised concerns about the book’s title. Green felt that any reference to the Ark might offend people in America because it could be regarded as labelling the victims of the Holocaust as passive, or worse, as animals, led to safety by Schindler ‘two by two.’

Keneally elaborates:

I had suggested two titles—Schindler’s Ark and Schindler’s List—indicating to Ion Trewin in London that I liked Ark better than List. It was not only the question of Noah’s ark, but the Ark of the Covenant, a symbol of the contract between Yahweh and the tribe of Israel. A similar though very rough compact had existed between Schindler and his people. If they did their work properly—if the accountant kept the books well, if the engineers and the people on the floor produced or, later in the war, if they appeared to be producing for the sake of covering his black-market operations—he would rescue them. I call it a ‘rough compact’ because of those people who were lost to the list through factors Schindler could not control. His behaviour in regard to the three hundred women sent to Auschwitz, however, indicates that in all probability he did what he could to keep his list intact.

In this passage, Keneally openly draws parallels between Schindler’s conduct during the war and the Old Testament stories of the Ark of the Covenant and Noah’s ark. Keneally’s understanding of Schindler’s life exemplifies George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s theory of metaphor and the role it plays in language and the mind. Lakoff and Johnson claim that the ‘essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing

---
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one kind of thing in terms of another.'

It is clear from Keneally’s comments that these Biblical narratives have been used as conceptual metaphors in order to understand and conceive Schindler’s life. The book’s title reveals how these conceptual metaphors have not only helped him understand the past but also to represent it because the possessive form of the singular noun ‘Schindler’ in the title indicates that the object, the ‘Ark’, is his—and not Noah’s or the Covenant’s—clearly indicating that the Ark has been used as a metaphor to make sense of Schindler’s life.

The method used by Keneally to articulate this metaphorical interpretation of Schindler’s life is characteristic of György Lukás’ notion of the dialectic of appearance and essence in literary realism. Lukás argues that the goal of realism is ‘to penetrate the laws governing objective reality and to uncover the deeper, hidden, mediated, not immediately perceptible network of relationships that go to make up society.’ According to Lukás, these relationships exist under the surface of reality, and the artist needs the requisite intellectual and artistic capacity to first identify and then conceal the relationships through the process of abstraction in the text. This process is called the ‘dialectic of appearance and essence’ because the artist constructs an artistically mediated ‘immediacy’ that is frozen—because it is a representation—but ‘appears’ to be living and is transparent enough to allow the ‘underlying essence to shine through (something which is not true of immediate experience in real life).’

Essentially, the salient details of realism relate to the décor, the character’s clothes, manner of speech and social habits that are consistent
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with the cultural era depicted in the narrative, that is, they constitute an empirically verifiable *appearance*. Hidden behind, or within, these conspicuous details are the rhetorical aspects, such as the motif, topoi, archetype, and symbolism, that enable the author to convey a generalised meaning or ‘truth’ about that particular representation of reality.

Keneally depicts the factual details of Schindler’s life in an accurate and consistent manner so that his account has the *appearance* of being true. It is important to note that the use of the term ‘appearance’ in this context is not to suggest that Keneally’s account is only superficially true, rather that his account is empirically verifiable and consistent with what ‘appears’ to be true. However, Keneally is also organising and arranging the narrative so that the salient features of Schindler’s life fit into the basic structure of these Biblical tales. This process requires a careful reconstruction of the past because the narrative needs to be sufficiently accurate to meet the factual requirements of the writer-reader contract and yet transparent enough to allow ‘the underlying essence to shine through...’

255 Using the rhetorical devices mentioned above.

From the very start of the book, when Keneally is searching Schindler’s childhood for signs of the man that he would become, his intention is clearly that the essence of Schindler’s story will shine through, despite the threadbare facts and an almost total lack of witnesses to Schindler’s early years. As he explains:

Oskar’s later history seems to call out for some set piece in his childhood...young Oskar should defend some bullied Jewish boy on the way home from school...[although]...it is a safe bet it didn’t happen, and we are happier not knowing, since the event would seem too pat.256


256 Thomas Keneally *Schindler’s Ark* (London: Sceptre, 2008), 37. [All subsequent references in this chapter will be in regard to this edition].
In this passage, Keneally claims to have been relieved that there is no evidence presaging Schindler’s later development. However, his admission that the industrialist’s later history ‘seems to call out for some set piece in his childhood…’ reveals how difficult it was for Keneally to remain objective and how not finding irrefutable evidence of a symbolic act or gesture on Schindler’s part did not prevent him from constructing romanticised and rhetorically loaded scenes from this period in his subject’s life.

On one particular occasion, Keneally appears to have imagined an entire scene on the basis that it could plausibly have happened. Although this scene is relatively brief and designed to convey the profound injustice inflicted on Jews in mainland Europe, it is established on dubious factual grounds. The scene in question involves the liberal Rabbi, Dr Felix Kantor, who lived next door to the young Oskar Schindler and his family when they were living in Zwittau, in what is now the Czech Republic:

Rabbi Kantor’s two sons went to the same school as the son of his German neighbour. Perhaps both boys were bright enough to become two of the rare Jewish professors at the German University in Prague in later life. These close-cropped German-speaking prodigies raced in knee-length shorts around the summer garden of either house. Chasing the Schindler children and being chased. And Kantor, watching them flash in and out among the yew hedges, might have thought it was working as Geiger and Graetz and Lazarus and all those other nineteenth century German Jewish liberals had predicted. We lead enlightened lives, we are greeted by German neighbours—Herr Schindler will even make snide remarks about Czech statesmen in our hearing. We are secular scholars as well as sensible interpreters of the Talmud. We belong both to the twentieth century and to the ancient tribal race. We are neither offensive nor offended against.

Later, in the mid-thirties, the rabbi would revise this happy estimation and make up his mind in the end that his sons could never buy off the National Socialists with a German language Ph.D, that there was no outcrop of twentieth century technology or secular scholarship behind which a Jew could find sanctuary, any more than there could be a species of rabbi acceptable to the new German legislators. In 1936 all the Kantors moved to Belgium. The Schindlers never heard of them again.

This passage is written in 3rd PP using a transparent-independent narrative voice. The first sentence states declaratively that Kantor’s two sons went to school with Oskar. Then the next sentence begins with the speculative adverb, ‘Perhaps’, indicating to
the reader that what follows is uncertain because, as Helen Fulton explains, ‘Modal adjuncts such as ‘perhaps’, ‘possibly’, and ‘almost certainly’ similarly express a low modality, or a relative lack of faith in a truth claim, which is why they are not often used in journalism, where the aim is to convey truth and factuality.’

Joseph Melia explains that there has been a great deal of debate regarding linguistic modality, which Jan Nuyts says is due to it being ‘very hard to delineate in simple, positive terms.’ Heiko Narrog argues that researchers have tended to define modality in terms of ‘speaker attitudes’ or ‘subjectivity’, which he says is not very meaningful because speaker attitudes are expressed through a great variety of grammatical and lexical categories, making it ‘impossible to identify a single grammatical category, or even a definite set of categories, associated with it.’ Narrog says that modality can be more appropriately defined in terms of ‘factuality’, which is a more relevant approach for this particular study. He states that modality is a linguistic category referring to the factual status of a proposition; a proposition ‘is modalized if it is marked for being undetermined with respect to its factual status, i.e. is neither positively nor negatively factual.’ According to Narrog, the notion of ‘factuality’ has two advantages. Firstly, it can be identified with ‘exponents of traditional core modal meanings such as necessity, obligation, possibility, or probability at the center of it…’ Secondly, in contrast to ‘speaker attitudes,’ this
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approach is ‘suitable to actually delimit a category, the result being a semantically defined grammatical category.’

Returning to the second sentence in the passage above, Keneally uses the modal adjunct, ‘Perhaps’, to forewarn the reader that the factual status of the proposition is undetermined, indicating that there is a low degree of probability that what is expressed—Kantor’s two children becoming professors in a German university—will actually happen due to the political and racial impediments created by the war. Although Keneally may have met his obligations to the writer-reader contract by informing the reader that the factual status of the statement is being undermined, the sentence itself is rhetorically significant because the narrator is using the past tense and low modality to depict what could have been—for example, the children becoming professors, and in doing so impregnates the scene with a sense of foreboding based on a recognition of Germany’s future.

Modality gives Keneally license to imaginatively re-create episodes in Schindler’s past. In the passage above, the narrator paints a halcyon image of pre-war European society where Jewish and non-Jewish children are free to run around and play together, and states that Rabbi Kantor watched them play. The reader is told that this ‘might’ have inspired the Rabbi to believe that the predictions of German Jewish liberals were finally coming true and that mankind was entering an enlightened period of tolerance and equality, but this is, of course, of undetermined factual status. Yet, there are no specific details about when exactly Rabbi Kantor watched the children play or if anyone else saw this happen. The veracity of this scene is further undermined by Keneally’s admission that ‘there were no witnesses left to the dynamics of that household, except in the most general terms.’ (36). Admittedly,
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Keneally is referring to the Schindlers’ household rather than the Kantors’, but the fact that the Kantors were not heard of again after 1936 strongly suggests that they did not provide any information concerning this scene. This raises the following question: If there were no witnesses left from either of these two families, who was Keneally’s source?

The last four sentences of the first paragraph are telling due to the narrator’s repeated use of the plural pronoun ‘we’ at the start of each sentence. The Oxford Dictionary states that ‘we’ is used by a speaker to refer to himself or herself and one or more other people considered together.\textsuperscript{264} Leading up to this scene, the narrator reveals that ‘Rabbi Kantor was a good disciple of Abraham Geiger…who claimed that it was no crime, in fact was praiseworthy to be a German as well as a Jew…’ (37). It is clear, therefore, that the ‘we’ in this instance is being used to identify the speaker with Kantor and Geiger, Graetz, Lazarus ‘and all those other nineteenth century German Jewish liberals.’ This is an example of close third person (CTP) because the narrator has taken on the properties of the actors and ‘now seems to “own” the words.’\textsuperscript{265} This is reflected in the narrative voice, which changes from transparent-independent to transparent-dependent because it is repeating ‘the utterances (and thus the discourse) of the sources.’\textsuperscript{266} The narration remains transparent because, even though it is identified with Kantor and the scholars, it ‘lets the issues, events and people included in the narration present themselves; it allows the “world” to explain itself.’\textsuperscript{267}

\textsuperscript{265}Wood, How Fiction Works, 9.
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The four sentences at the end of the first paragraph are a literary attempt at giving these German Jewish liberals a collective voice, which allows Keneally to speak out against the grave injustice meted out to them. Nonetheless, this is quite clearly a fictional representation and illustrates the imaginative freedom that Keneally has afforded himself in this text. The issue is that Keneally has created the collective voice from thoughts that only Kantor may have had in this instance. In other words, the fictional representation has been derived from a supposition, which in turn has been based on a scene with no obvious sources. This conflicts with the prefatory statements Keneally makes in the ‘Author’s Note’:

To use the texture and devices of a novel to tell a true story is a course which has frequently been followed in modern writing. It is one I have chosen to follow here; both because the craft of the novelist is the only craft to which I can lay claim, and because the novel’s techniques seem suited for a character of such ambiguity and magnitude as Oskar. I have attempted to avoid all fiction, though, since fiction would debase the record, and to distinguish between reality and the myths which are likely to attach themselves to a man of Oskar’s stature. (13-4)

These comments are a disclaimer and essentially detail the terms of the writer-reader contract for this particular text. It may be appropriate to pardon Keneally for his flights of fancy when recounting Schindler’s childhood because of the scant information available. However, such latitude cannot be given to his account of Schindler’s activities during the Holocaust because of the extensive historical data at Keneally’s disposal as well as his access to the so-called Schindlerjuden, who were encouraged by Leopold Pfefferberg—a fellow Schindler survivor himself—to be interviewed by Keneally.

In Searching for Schindler, Keneally’s memoir of his fateful meeting with Pfefferberg in Beverly Hills and his subsequent decision to write about Schindler’s exploits during the war, reveals the process that he put in place to verify all accounts: ‘things that were said by one interviewee would have to be matched or weighed against what the historic record said, against context and the memories of other
former Schindlerjuden. He also sent his manuscript ‘to some 20 Schindler survivors…’ so that they could proof read it to make sure that it matched their memory of events, revealing what a time-consuming and collaborative effort this book was to create.

Oskar Schindler was not a publicly obscure figure before Schindler’s Ark was published. According to Michael Hulse, movie-director Fritz Lang had considered making a film about Schindler as early as 1951 but decided to drop the plan. The idea was bandied about in Hollywood at various stages during the 1960s but nothing came to fruition. Although Keneally did not have the opportunity to interview Schindler himself, The American Joint Distribution Committee conducted an investigation into Schindler’s life and wartime activities and The Department of Testimonies of the Yad Vashem had summoned Schindler to give a general statement, along with hundreds of survivors at his factory, who gave sworn statements about his conduct. The findings from both of these inquiries are publicly available in the archives at the Yad Vashem library, which Keneally visited during a research expedition to the Middle East with his wife, Judy, and Leopold Pfefferberg. Also on this trip, he interviewed Justice Moshe Bejski, who was an Israeli Supreme Court Judge, a prominent Holocaust survivor, and one of the Schindlerjuden, who, along with
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Pfefferberg, provided various documents and newspaper cuttings that spanned decades.²⁷⁵

Keneally reveals that he had intended to write the text ‘in the tradition of Capote and early Tom Wolfe...’²⁷⁶—a reference to Capote’s *In Cold Blood* and the four texts that Wolfe wrote between 1968-1970, namely: *The Kandy-Kolored Tangerine-Flake Streamline Baby*, *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, *The Pump House Gang*, and *Radical Chic & Mau-Mauing the Flak Catchers*. As Eason states, these latter four texts are examples of RLJ because in them Wolfe explores alternative realities, such as the countercultural movement and the New York social elite, which pose ‘no threat to the reporters’ faith that they can discover, comprehend and communicate the real.’²⁷⁷ However, under the reformulation of RLJ proposed in this thesis, these texts would be situated in the middle of the spectrum between the poles of RLJ and MLJ on Webb’s continuum. This is because Wolfe’s overt presence is consistent with MLJ although he does not show any hesitancy in foreclosing the question: ‘Is this real?’. He does not consider any of the ethical implications involved in creating narrative worlds for anonymous readers and blurs the traditional distinctions between fantasy and reality. It is important to note that Eason defines realism in literary journalism as ‘giving accounts of “what it is that’s going on here” that suggest “This is reality.”’²⁷⁸ This thesis, however, contends that realist reporters are aware of ‘the degree to which the creation of illusion is essential in the realist process...’²⁷⁹ and are not claiming that ‘This is reality’. Realism, therefore, is

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 162.
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²⁷⁸ Ibid., 52.
proposed as an aesthetic style that does not necessarily claim exact correspondence between reality and the text.

Ultimately, *Schindler’s Ark* has much more in common with *In Cold Blood* than any of Wolfe’s texts, even though the first chapter is an exposition on Schindler’s upbringing and early life and has a relatively identifiable but independent narrative voice. The narrator in chapter one is comparable to Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg’s concept of the ‘histor’, which they describe as a narrator that ‘examines the past with an eye toward separating out actuality from myth.’ The narrator in chapter one shows concern for this distinction by claiming that ‘we are happier not knowing…’ about a young Schindler defending ‘some bullied Jewish boy on the way home from school…’ (37). Scholes and Kellogg explain that the histor is not a character in the narrative but is not exactly the writer either: it is ‘a persona, a projection of the author’s empirical virtues…a tireless investigator and sorter, a sober impartial judge…entitled not only to present the facts as [she] has established them but to comment on them, to draw parallels, to moralize, to generalize…’ This describes the narrator in chapter one which examines Schindler’s past in an open and discursive manner (‘Tragatsch surmised that the reasons Oskar’s career as a motorbike racer ended there were economic. It was a fair guess…’ (27)) and is inextricably linked with Keneally’s intradiegetic persona.

When the focus switches from Schindler’s upbringing in Czechoslovakia to Cracow at the start of the war, it is instantly recognisable that the narrative has changed ‘from merely chronological narrative toward more esthetically satisfying
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patterns…'\textsuperscript{282} Literary techniques relating to plot, narrative perspective, style, theme, and character are the matrix of these patterns. The story of Schindler’s actions during the Holocaust, which represents the main body of the text, exhibits ‘the texture and devices of a novel…’ (13). Apart from the occasions when the histor emerges to qualify a statement or shed light on a particular ambiguity, the narrative voice is transparent-independent, positioned ‘above’ the world it narrates and restricted ‘to the “outside view,” reporting what would be visible or audible to a virtual camera.’\textsuperscript{283} Dwight MacDonald calls this type of nonfictional narrator the ‘Recording Angel’ because the writer ‘calculatingly keeps himself out of the picture…'\textsuperscript{284}. Essentially, the Recording Angel displays a ‘tendency towards narration rather than discourse, and the reluctance to interpret, instead allowing facts to “speak for themselves.”'\textsuperscript{285} Phyllis Frus refers to this as ‘aestheticized objective narration’\textsuperscript{286}, which stands as a useful definition of RLJ’s narratorial style.

After the biographical section in chapter one, the Recording Angel narrator begins by orientating the reader historically and geographically: ‘In late October 1939 two German NCOs\textsuperscript{287} of a grenadier regiment entered the showroom of J. C. Buchheister & Company in Stradom Street, Cracow…’ (45). This sentence is followed by a description of a ‘Jewish employee behind the counter, a yellow star sewn on his breast…'\textsuperscript{288} Using Freytag’s triangle as a general model for narrative progression, these first two sentences represent the exposition because the narrator
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introduces the actors, settings, and initial state of affairs.\(^\text{289}\) The two soldiers, described as ‘healthy looking young men who had spent all spring and summer on manoeuvres…yielding them an easy triumph and then all the latitude of conquerors in a sweet city…’ (45)—a reference to their involvement in the invasion of Poland—force the Jewish employee to accept a Bavarian banknote and a ‘piece of German army occupation scrip…’ (45) that is no longer legal tender. This mini-drama at the start of the book represents the ‘rising action’\(^\text{290}\) of the narrative.

When the accounts are audited later that day by a young German accounts manager assigned to J. C. Buchheister & Company on behalf of the East Trust Agency—an organisation mandated by the Nazi-satellite government in Poland to takeover and run Jewish businesses—the manager accuses the Jewish employee of ‘substituting the antique notes for hard zloty…’ (45) and informs his supervisor, Sepp Aue—described as ‘a middle-aged unambitious man…’ (45). The accounts manager encourages Aue to report the matter to the Schutzpolizei, which both men know will cement the employee’s fate once and for all. This represents the highpoint of the action, the apex of Freytag’s pyramidal structure. However, Aue is presented with a dilemma: the narrator reveals that he has a Jewish grandmother that he has been keeping secret from the authorities. In a bid to rectify the situation, he sends for the company’s original Jewish accountant, a Polish man called Itzhak Stern, whom he hopes will know what to do. Aue’s frantic efforts to contact Stern signifies ‘the falling action’\(^\text{291}\) in Freytag’s Triangle because Stern’s arrival marks the dénouement, as he immediately throws the illegal tender into the open fire (47), destroying the evidence.
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The dramatic structure of this narrative progression uncovers the circumstances that lead to Stern and Schindler’s fateful meeting at the factory. Prior to Stern’s arrival, and during the climactic point of the banknote debacle, Aue’s secretary informs him that Oskar Schindler has arrived for an appointment. According to the account in Schindler’s Ark, Sepp Aue had met Schindler for the first time at a party the night before, where he had drunkenly invited Oskar to inspect the factory due to Schindler’s declared interest in the textile industry (46). However, this version of events has been called into question in a recent exposé by David Crowe, who suggests that Schindler, using the pseudonym ‘Zeiler’, had known Josef “Sepp” Aue prior to the invasion of Poland and had blackmailed him into becoming an Abewhr (German military intelligence) agent. Crowe explains that ‘Aue worked for Oskar in Kraków, where Schindler helped him to obtain a factory.’ Stern appears to verify Crowe’s claims, claiming in an interview that Aue had told him he was introducing him to an ‘old friend’ at the factory, which is inconsistent with how his meeting with Schindler is depicted in the text.

There are no quotation marks used in the conversation between Aue and Schindler at the factory, yet speech marks are used on the next page, when Stern is introduced to Schindler: “‘Well,’” Herr Schindler growled at him, “‘I’m a German. So there we are!’” (48). In the intervening period between Schindler’s conversation with Aue and Stern entering Aue’s office, a subtle switch in perspective takes place, as Keneally shifts from one source to the next. It is reasonable to assume that Schindler is the source informing the narrative before Stern’s arrival because it has been subsequently revealed that Aue gave a damning indictment about Schindler’s Abewhr

activities to the Czech secret police after the war.\footnote{Crowe, Oskar Schindler, 63.} It is therefore unlikely that Aue would have endorsed the claim that Schindler was present at the factory purely because of a drunken invitation the night before. This indicates that Aue was not consulted about this episode; otherwise Keneally would presumably have been forced to either acknowledge the contentiousness of this episode or abandon it altogether. In fact, as Crowe explains, the ‘Czech secret police files and Schindler’s own comments about this were not available to the Australian novelist when he did his research for Schindler’s List in the early 1980s…’\footnote{Ibid., 99.}, which was later confirmed by Keneally in his memoir.\footnote{Keneally, Searching for Schindler, 114.} Even though it is not entirely clear from the narrative who Keneally’s source was, the absence of speech marks in the Aue/Schindler conversation is an acknowledgement of its undetermined factual status. Keneally admits in the ‘Author’s Note’ that he felt it necessary ‘to reconstruct conversations of which Oskar and others have left only the briefest record…’\footnote{Ibid., 14.}, so the omission of speech marks is a deft grammatical method for indicating factual uncertainty without having to use the histor and disturb the aestheticized objective narration of the Recording Angel.

In accordance with Kenneth Burke’s semantic ideal of the literary form, the Recording Angel ‘does not judge, but describes or places…how things are…’\footnote{Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form: Symbolic Action, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 151.} Burke explains that if the semantic ideal were to envision drama, it would ‘be aside from the battle, stressing the role of observer, whose observations it is hoped will define situations with sufficient realistic accuracy to prepare an adequate chart for the action…’\footnote{Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, 149.}. The Recording Angel is, by definition, an (extradiegetic) observer that is
CHAPTER 6: Schindler’s Ark

capable of charting an indeterminate world with an ‘incisiveness, an accuracy of formulation…that makes itself a style.’

The semantic ideal only represents one order of meaning in Schindler’s Ark. The other, which Burke calls the poetic ideal, is derived from the empirically unverifiable semantic meaning of Oskar Schindler’s life. While this meaning is incorporeal, evanescent and latent, it can be perceived on an emotional and subconscious level. Burke explains that if the poetic ideal were required to envision drama, it would ‘contend, by implication, that true knowledge can only be attained through the battle, stressing the role of the participant, who in the course of his participation, it is hoped, will define situations with sufficient realistic accuracy to prepare an image for action.’ Keneally would have gleaned the poetic meaning of Schindler’s life from Schindler’s friend Leopold Pfefferberg (‘I was saved, and my wife was saved, by a Nazi…to me he’s Jesus Christ…to me he is God…’) and his conversations with other Schindlerjuden, who actually witnessed and were affected by Schindler’s actions in Cracow. Therefore, the poetic meaning in Schindler’s Ark is a consequence of Keneally’s contact with the people Schindler helped save; they are the ones responsible for how Keneally conceived this semantic meaning which allowed him to impose ‘a meaning on the events that make up its story level by revealing at the end a structure that was immanent in the events all along.’

In a recent biography on Truman Capote, Gerald Clark describes the dramatic moment when Capote, while holidaying in Palamós, had an epiphany concerning the significance of the Clutter murders:
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As he sat there in his cliffside home, gazing out at the gentle waters of the Mediterranean, he also comprehended, probably for the first time, the full dimensions of what he was seeking to do. In Cold Blood…was not just the chronicle of a gruesome crime; a tale of a good family and virtuous family being pursued and destroyed by the forces beyond its knowledge or control. It was a theme that reverberated like Greek tragedy, a story that Aeschylus or Sophocles might have turned into a drama of destiny or fate.  

Carl Jung suggests that through ‘fantasy’ or intense imagining, an individual can make ‘discoveries’, envisage fundamental patterns, ‘spontaneously, at any time, at any place, and without any outside influence.’ The above passage depicts the moment that Capote envisaged the fundamental pattern of the Clutter family murders as a Greek tragedy; an archetypal story of the forces of good and evil. It was in this moment that Capote perceived the latent poetic meaning of the crime. In Searching for Schindler, Keneally describes a similar experience when he visited what was formerly the Deutsche Email Fabrik enamel and munitions factory in Cracow, and saw, for the first time, the stairs that led up to Schindler’s office:

These stairs Oskar had ascended and descended on business. So had Itzhak Stern, Oskar’s accountant, and Abraham Bankier, who was related to the family connected with the bankrupt factory Oskar had acquired. These characters were becoming mythic to me, yet familiar, and their former occupancy gave the banal building a legendary status.  

By visiting the exact site where over 800 lives are believed to have been saved, Keneally was able to visualise Schindler, Stern, and all the other important actors in the story going about their business during the war. This encouraged Keneally to conceive these figures as ‘mythic’ and the building as having ‘legendary status’, illustrating how realist reporters tie themselves to the actual world but also turn their
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imagination outward to this world to create meaningful designs out of their experience of it.\textsuperscript{307}

What is of vital importance to this analysis, however, is how Keneally depicts the poetic meaning of Schindler’s life in the narrative without impinging on the semantic ideal of this particular text, and of RLJ in general. \textit{Schindler’s Ark} is a factually accurate and semantically idealised representation of Schindler’s life that reifies the spiritual significance and poetic meaning of his moral transformation. In short, Keneally’s book is a ‘figural interpretation of real events…’\textsuperscript{308}, imitating a technique that was used for vernacular heroic epics in the 12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} centuries which subsumed historical events within their thinly veiled Church dogma.\textsuperscript{309} Erich Auerbach calls this the ‘figural tradition’\textsuperscript{310} and explains how it works:

\begin{quote}
This figural tradition played no small part in discrediting the horizontal, historical connections between events and in encouraging rigidification of all categories. Thus the prayers...exhibit the figures of redemption completely rigidified. The parceling of the events of the Old Testament, which are interpreted figurally in isolation from their historic context, has become a formula. The figures...are placed side by side paratactically. They no longer have any reality, they have only signification. With respect to the events of this world, a similar tendency prevails: to remove them from their horizontal context, to isolate the individual fragments, to force them into a fixed frame, and, within it, to make them impressive gesturally, so that they appear as exemplary, as models, as significant, and to leave all “the rest” in abeyance. It is easy to see that such a procedure permits but a small, extremely low proportion of reality to assume visual plasticity, that portion which the crystallized idioms of established categories are able to convey.\textsuperscript{311}
\end{quote}

As a conscientious literary journalist, Keneally actively tries to resist rigidification in \textit{Schindler’s Ark} by confronting the ambiguity and complexity of the past through a multi-faceted approach that includes a histor narrator, modalisation, and other grammatical mechanisms and indicators. As Keneally’s desire is to tell the story in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{307} Hellmann, \textit{Fables of Fact}, 12.  \\
\textsuperscript{309} Auerbach, \textit{Mimesis}, 120-2.  \\
\textsuperscript{310} Ibid., 116.  \\
\textsuperscript{311} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
the realist tradition of Wolfe’s earlier work and Capote, Schindler’s Ark is a human-interest story that ‘moves toward closure and the establishment of “moral authority”…’ 312. Of course, the necessary conflation of comprehension and composition dictates that the events must be recorded in some discernible pattern that orders reality, even if, as Hayden White has argued, it is the fact that these events can be recorded ‘in an order of narrative, that makes them, at one and the same time, questionable as to their authenticity and susceptible to being considered as tokens of reality’. 313 Keneally attempts to save the semantic ideal from being compromised by the poetic meaning of his figural interpretation by relentlessly appraising the validity and value of the historical/factual information. He does this by actively highlighting the ‘vraisemblablisation’ (the ‘importance of cultural models…as sources of meaning and coherence…’) of the text in the title, and constantly throughout.

Direct and indirect Biblical references are made, for example, when the pathological murderer, Commandant Amon Goeth, is first introduced. His propensity for sunbathing topless on the balcony of his villa overlooking Forced Labour Camp Plaszów is given special attention: ‘Next summer he’d make a fat sun-worshipper. But in this particular version of Jerusalem he’d be safe from mockery.’ (38). The droll description of Goeth as a ‘fat sun-worshipper’ in the first sentence of this passage is a clear case of affectation, illustrating how RLJ, in typical postmodern form, never abandons its referential function but, at times, preserves it ironically. 315 The significance of this reference does not become apparent until Chapter 22, when the narrator depicts one of the most iconic acts of depravity and evil in the entire text,

312 Frus, The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative, 22.
313 White, Content of the Form, 20.
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which is emblematic of Goeth’s seething racial hatred that has, by this point, reached its apotheosis:

Wearing a shirt and riding britches and boots on which his orderly had put a high shine, he would emerge on the steps of his temporary villa. (They were renovating a better place for him down at the other end of the camp perimeter.) As the season wore on he would appear without his shirt, for he loved the sun…He would scan the camp area, the work at the quarry, the prisoners pushing or hauling the quarry trucks on the rails which passed by his door. Those glancing up could see the smoke from the cigarette which he held clamped between his lips, the way a man smokes without hands when he is too busy to put down the tools of his trade…With one blast from the doorstep, the man was plucked out of the group of pushing and pulling captives and hurled sideways in the road. (211)

Amidst the banal details of this unconscionable crime, with Goeth carefully selecting a victim, his nonchalant stance, and so on, Goeth is described appearing ‘without his shirt’. This description of Goeth enjoying the sun with his shirt off relates back to an epithet used in Chapter 2 that referred to him as ‘a fat sun-worshipper’ and informed the reader that ‘in this particular version of Jerusalem he’d be safe from mockery.’ (38). The earlier reference is of course an endophoric expression as it pre-empts an event that has already happened (Goeth sniping at these innocent victims), illustrating how, like Capote, Keneally foreshadows dramatic events in the text.316

Describing the Forced Labour Camp Plaszów as ‘this particular version of Jerusalem…’ is a clear reference to the continued displacement of the Israelites, who, since the first Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar II in 586 BCE, had been forced to live in exile. This has had a profound and lasting spiritual effect on the people, as Hava Lazarus-Yafeh explains: ‘We know of course how the Sages reorganized the spiritual life of Israel without the Temple, but mourning upon its destruction and the destruction of the city of Jerusalem remained an integral part of Jewish life ever since, and among some it became the central idea of their whole

316 Hollowell, Fact & Fiction, 71.
life.’ However, the Biblical scriptures tell of the covenant God made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in response to the Israelites’ appeal for salvation; a promise that they would one day return to their holy land and live in peace, without fear. Forced Labour Camp Plaszów can therefore be described as a ‘version’ or proxy of Jerusalem; a final stepping-stone before the European Jews would finally return to their promised land and hold men such as Amon Goeth responsible for their actions. This example shows how a simple, but carefully worded reference, transforms the way historical events are understood—events are placed not only in a socio-political context but linked to other events spanning the length of human history and also pre-empt the future and spiritual significance of this ordeal, which led to the Jews’ predestined return to the Holy Land.

Keneally’s strategy of using Biblical narratives as conceptual metaphors in Schindler’s Ark is an attempt to convey profound historical and spiritual significance of the Holocaust by bringing it ‘within the modes of order which culture makes available...by talking about it in a mode of discourse which a culture takes as natural.’ Keneally’s pseudo-religious interpretation of Schindler’s life and conduct during the Holocaust appears ‘natural’ because it allows the reader to understand partially what cannot be understood fully.
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In January 1982, Rigoberta Menchú, a twenty three year old indigenous Guatemalan woman, met with anthropologist Elisabeth Burgos-Debray in Paris and, over the course of a week, told her life story, which was recorded, transcribed and published by Burgos-Debray ‘as a testimonio, or oral autobiography, running 247 pages in English.’\textsuperscript{321} Arturo Arias explains that Menchú had been working on behalf of Mexico’s Committee for Peasant Unity (CUC) and other circles close to the Guatemalan opposition and its solidarity groups. Having begun to be recognised as an articulate spokesperson for the movement, she was sent on a promotional tour to the United States and Europe ‘in order to alert the world to the ruthlessness and viciousness of the Guatemalan regime, which was implementing a process of “ethnic cleansing.”’\textsuperscript{322}

Since the 1970s, indigenous communities in Guatemala had begun to form alliances so as to oppose this escalating state repression. They were faced with ‘increased mobilization and demands for reform, the state and the ruling class, through their police, military, and death squads, responded with untold violence and repression.’\textsuperscript{323} By 1981, armed revolutionaries were stepping up their actions in the capital and sixteen of the country’s twenty-two provinces. Having lost the support of the U.S. administration due to human rights violations, ‘it was becoming increasingly clear to ranking military officials that the army needed a new strategy to defeat the
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guerrillas.\textsuperscript{324} The military’s new strategy had two stages. The first involved the annihilation of the urban insurgency to prevent the guerrilla organisations from consolidating their political presence in Guatemala.\textsuperscript{325} The second stage involved moving thousands of government troops into the mountains for rural purification.\textsuperscript{326} Menchú was specifically targeted by this new initiative because she, along with most of the adult members of her family, had become actively involved in the guerrilla movement—her father had been one of the founders of the CUC.\textsuperscript{327} She was subsequently forced into exile: ‘The compañeros got me out on a plane to Mexico, and I felt a shattered, broken woman, because I’d never imagined that one day those criminals would force me to abandon my country.’\textsuperscript{328}

David Stoll explains that the text created by Menchú and Burgos-Debray, \textit{I, Rigoberta Menchú}, had the effect of immediately transforming Menchú into a powerful symbol for the persecuted indigenous population in Guatemala because the ‘destruction of her family stands for the deaths of thousands of others for whom justice could never be done…It enabled her to focus international condemnation on an institution that deserved it, the Guatemalan army.’\textsuperscript{329} Although Stoll has called into question many of Menchú’s claims in her testimonio, Mary Louise Pratt argues that it ‘undoubtedly saved many Guatemalan lives, including Menchú’s….’\textsuperscript{330} Principally, it alerted the international community to the human rights abuses that were taking place in Guatemala, obligating foreign governments and international bodies to demand

\textsuperscript{325} Grandin, et. al., The Guatemalan Reader, 362.
\textsuperscript{326} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{330} Mary Louise Pratt, “I, Rigoberta Menchú and the “Culture Wars”” in Arias The Rigoberta Menchú Controversy, 29.
accountability from the Guatemalan government and forcing the country’s elites to enter into UN-sponsored peace talks with the rebels.\footnote{Stoll, Rigoberta Menchú and the Story of All Poor Guatemalans, ch. 1.} Shortly thereafter, The Commission of Historical Clarification was established as part of the peace negotiations between the indigenous communities and the government, which finally brought Guatemala’s internal armed conflict to an end in 1996.\footnote{Grandin, et. al., The Guatemalan Reader, 386.}

The story of Bishop Juan Gerardi Conedera’s assassination—the focus of Francisco Goldman’s \textit{The Art of Political Murder}—begins two years after the end of the civil war, in April 1998. Gerardi was the founding director of the Guatemalan Archdiocese’s Office of Human Rights (OHDA), which ‘was the first grassroots human rights organization in Guatemala capable of operating on a national scale.’\footnote{Francisco Goldman, \textit{The Art of Political Murder: Who killed Bishop Gerardi?} (London: Atlantic Books Ltd., 2008), 21. [All subsequent references in this chapter will be in regard to this edition].} Margarita Carrera draws a parallel between Bishop Gerardi and Rigoberta Menchú, suggesting they were both assassinated—the former literally and the latter by way of a character assassination in the years following the publication of \textit{I, Rigoberta Menchú}. Gerardi was assassinated because he helped produce and publicise \textit{Guatemala: Never Again}, an unprecedented investigation into the atrocities committed by the Guatemalan military against its own people while Menchú, of course, was responsible for \textit{I, Rigoberta Menchú}. Consequently, Gerardi and Menchú are now considered as two of Guatemala’s greatest humanitarians.\footnote{Margarita Carrera, “Against Gerardi and against Rigoberta, attacks are continually made to make them lose some of their luster,” in Arias \textit{The Rigoberta Menchú Controversy}, 107.}

Goldman’s account of Gerardi’s murder begins on Sunday 26 April 1998, the eve of the murder, when the Bishop and those involved in the Recovery of Historical Memory Project (Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica), known as REHMI, were having a garden party to celebrate the completion of \textit{Guatemala: Never Again} (the
The public had been notified of the report’s general content at a press conference four days earlier (1-5). Goldman then provides the historical context of the report and its significance in relation to human rights in Guatemala. This is followed by a depiction of the immediate aftermath of the crime and the subsequent criminal investigations conducted by a legal team from the Catholic Church, MINUGUA (United Nations Peace Verification Mission) and the Guatemalan Public Ministry (prosecutors’ office). As the narrative account of the criminal investigation progresses, and each new discovery is made, Goldman reveals his theory that a group of retired Military Intelligence officers, known informally as Cofradía, conspired to organise the assassination of Gerardi on behalf of leading political and military figures, past and present, who were implicated in *Guatemala: Never Again*.

According to Goldman, the head of the secret organisation Cofradía was Colonel Byron Disrael Lima Estrada, who had formerly been in charge of Military Intelligence (code-named ‘G-2’), and had retained his connections with active high-ranking government and military officials. Goldman alleges that the members of Cofradía would regularly meet with General Marco Tulio Espinosa, who ran the Presidential Military Staff (Estado Mayor Presidential, or EMP) before he took charge of the Army High Command, and finally the minister of defence under President Arzú (361). Colonel Lima’s son, Captain Byron Lima Oliva, a former Kaibil special-forces soldier who was currently in charge of President Arzú’s security detail, was purportedly tasked with conducting the assassination because he ‘belonged to the controversial anti-kidnapping commando unit of the EMP to which his father, the retired colonel, reportedly served as an adviser.’ (88). Captain Lima, along with his understudy, Sergeant Major Obdulio Villanueva, were eventually convicted of
carrying out the murder of Bishop Gerardi while Colonel Lima was found guilty of masterminding it.

Goldman alleges that these three men—the only people convicted for the murder—were part of a wider conspiracy that conducted ‘an elaborately staged crime and cover-up…’ (268) which involved an array of undercover operatives. For instance, intelligence agents pretended to be indigent park-dwellers so that they could sleep on the grounds of the San Sebastián church (in Bishop Gerardi’s diocese) to spy on Gerardi while an EMP photographer posed as a journalist so that he could monitor the immediate aftermath and response to the crimes. Also involved were high ranking officers and politicians who had authorised the crime, as well as sympathetic news agencies and several significant media figures, such as Rico and de la Grange, and an (unnamed) host of an influential Guatemalan talk-show (286).

*The Art of Political Murder* is a passionate and convincing attempt by Goldman to expose the perpetrators of the crime and prove that Gerardi was assassinated by the army because of the threat he posed in his role as head of REHMI. Goldman describes it as the ‘perfect’ (123) crime because most of those responsible were never fully identified while those that were implicated managed to shroud their culpability in doubt. To reveal the ‘Art’ of this political murder, Goldman uses various pieces of information derived from his interviews, extensive research, and personal experiences and investigations in Guatemala. By switching between first-person perspective (1st PP) and third-person perspective (3rd PP), Goldman is able to create a diverse account, comprising expository writing, historiography and the dramatic reconstruction of events. One section in *The Art of Political Murder* fits the criteria for RLJ: a scene-by-scene reconstruction of Bishop Gerardi’s assassination—this is the first section of the book, which is called, simply: “The Murder.” This text
has value for the analysis of RLJ because, in dramatically representing the Bishop’s murder using this particular mode of literary journalism, Goldman aims to elicit a strong emotional response in the reader through his version of events. Ultimately, *The Art of Political Murder* is the least overtly objective RLJ text analysed in this thesis because Goldman’s emotional and moral vision is clearly apparent throughout. The text is therefore influenced by rationalism and romanticism, which is why its location on Webb’s continuum is nearly equidistant between the poles of RLJ and MLJ.

The text is also firmly situated in the Western/Anglophone tradition of literary journalism rather than the Latin American tradition, despite Goldman’s close familial ties with Guatemala (his mother is a Guatemala Catholic). Not only was the book written in English but Goldman had also written a feature article for *The New Yorker* about the crime eleven months after it happened, in 1999. That article, entitled ‘Annals of Crime: Murder Comes for the Bishop’, is a precursor to *The Art of Political Murder* and provides a detailed depiction of the Bishop’s murder and the ensuing investigation which the book draws upon heavily in its opening stages. In the article, Goldman postulates the same theory as appears in the book, namely, that the army had attempted to implicate the Church in the murder by making it appear that the domestic relationship between Gerardi and his vice-parish priest, Father Mario Orantes, had resulted in a homosexual crime of passion. He explains: ‘Discrediting the Church, or at any rate the wing of the Church that was attempting to achieve a kind of “justice” beyond that mandated by the peace accords, was compatible with the policies of President Arzú.’

---

As with Thomas Keneally’s title for Oskar Schindler’s life story, Goldman’s title clearly expresses how Gerardi’s murder is valued and categorised in the text. One of Goldman’s prime motivations for writing this political exposé was to counteract Maite Rico and Bertrand de la Grange’s account of the murder in ¿Quién mató al Obispo?—Autopsia de un crimen politico (Who Killed the Bishop?—Autopsy of a Political Crime), which he says was ‘kicking up a storm in Guatemala…’ (326). Goldman’s book title, The Art of Political Murder: Who killed Bishop Gerardi?, inverts Rico and de la Grange’s title such that the question, ¿Quién mató al Obispo? (‘Who Killed the Bishop?’), is no longer the title proper but the subtitle. Goldman criticises Rico and de la Grange for ‘floating’ all of the theories concerning the murder ‘as simultaneous possibilities without offering any serious evidence to prove or connect them.’ (267). Rico and de la Grange’s inconclusiveness is reflected in their main title, ¿Quién mató al Obispo? (‘Who Killed the Bishop?’), which is effectively an open-ended question about who committed the crime. By choosing to make the question ‘Who killed Bishop Gerardi?’ the subtitle, following ‘The Art of Political Murder’ as the main title, Goldman transforms the question into a rhetorical statement about the crime itself: that the ‘art’ of this political murder is the fact that the question, ‘Who killed Bishop Gerardi?’, is even asked—proof that the army may have gotten ‘away with it officially.’³³⁶


Goldman considers Gerardi’s assassination two days after the release of Guatemala: Never Again as irrefutable proof that the military were responsible for his death. As a result, all other theories and lines of enquiry that were reported in the media and entertained by the public—such as Bishop Gerardi being killed in a jealous rage by a jilted homosexual lover or because he discovered an organised criminal
racket involving Father Mario Orantes Nájera, the daughter of Monseñor Efraín Hernández’s housekeeper, Ana Lucía Escobar, and the Valle del Sol gang, who were supposedly stealing Church property and selling it on the black market—are attacked by Goldman, who presents them as fictions propagated by the Guatemalan military and its sympathisers in the media and government. The text does not attempt to reevaluate the evidence or the murder itself; rather, it asseverates a disputed, politicised version of events. This becomes problematic when the narrative switches to RLJ because this style implies that the known facts about the crime are being depicted neutrally and objectively. However, it is clear that Goldman has used this mode of literary journalism as a way of legitimising his own version of events.

The difference between the RLJ sections in *The Art of Political Murder* and other more typical examples is that Goldman does not raise any questions about the narrative’s status as nonfiction and exploits RLJ as a ‘communicational technique whose function is to reveal a story that exists “out there” in real life.’\(^{337}\) Or, to rephrase Barthes: he puts the mask in place but does not simultaneously point it out to the reader. In order to explore this strategy further, Bakhtin’s concept of the chronotope is useful. According to Luis Alberto Brandão, Bakhtin’s concept of the chronotope was loosely derived from Albert Einstein’s theory of relativity. He argues that Einstein’s theory contradicted the common sense of ‘pre-scientific’ thought, which conceives space and time as ‘real things’, directly observable by sense experience. Einstein claimed that time is incorporated into space as one of the dimensions in a four dimensional space.\(^{338}\) Bakhtin uses the term ‘chronotope’ (which
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he dubs ‘time space’\textsuperscript{339} to refer to ‘the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are expressed in literature.’ (84). Time and space in Bakhtin’s literary artistic chronotope—in accordance with Einstein’s fourth dimension of space—are fused ‘into one carefully thought out, concrete whole’ signified in the narrative by spatial and temporal markers (84). As Bakhtin explains:

Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope. (84)

Bakhtin states that, on a basic level, the inseparable unity of time and space markers can be seen in any meeting between two or more characters because the ‘temporal marker (“at one and the same time”) is inseparable from the spatial marker (“in one and the same place”).’ (97). For instance, if a meeting between two people in a story fails to take place for whatever reason, the synchronicity remains but the person who did not arrive at the specified time and place bears a negative sign, according to the ‘elementary clear, formal, almost mathematical character…’ (97) of the chronotope. The reason for this is that every meeting, even if it is a chance meeting, has a unique time and place that exists independently of all human activity and arrangements. However, as Bakhtin argues, the motif of meeting is ‘impossible in isolation: it always enters as a constituent element of the plot into the concrete unity of the entire work, and consequently, is part of the encompassing chronotope that subsumes it….’ (97). Chronotopes, therefore, are the ‘organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events in the novel…where the knots of narrative are tied and untied.’ (250). Moreover, the meeting itself is given further meaning and becomes ‘more concrete and saturated with a time that is more substantial…’ (120) by the

\textsuperscript{339}Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, \textit{The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays}, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981), 84. [All subsequent references in this chapter will be in regard to this edition].
environment and era in which it takes place—that is, the concrete chronotope that subsumes it. The chronotope is characterised, therefore, not only by the relation of formal devices of space (such as the mise-en-scène) and time (such as prolepsis or flashbacks) but also by the combination of space/time as it relates ‘to the historical and cultural conditions in which…[the chronotopes]…arise.’

According to Deborah Mutnick, Bakhtin sought to create a historical poetics of literature ‘that could comprehend and characterize particular sociohistorical epochs and genres.’ She uses Paule Marshall’s novel, *Brown Girl, Brownstones*, to illustrate how places—in particular, homes and buildings—are ‘suffused by a sense of time not only of the moment but also of the past and the press of the future.’ Bakhtin was aware of architecture’s propensity to convey what James Lawson calls ‘space-time settings’ in the narrative, commenting that Honoré de Balzac had an extraordinary ability to ‘see’ time, which he conveyed in his ‘depiction of houses as materialized history and his description of streets, cities, rural landscapes at the level where they are being worked upon by time and history.’ (247).

In his article ‘Space, Time and Power: The Chronotopes of Uwe Tellkamps’ *Der Turm,*’ David Clarke reveals how Tellkamp, in his bestselling German novel, takes this process of depicting ‘space-time’ one step further. In this novel, the cityscape of the ‘Turmviertel’ of Dresden—a fictional, dystopian version of the suburb of Weißer Hirsch—has been adapted in order to express the ideological and cultural control of the Social Unity Party on its populace. For instance, Clarke explains that on one occasion, Tellkamp uses the journey of the sixteen-year-old
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character, Christian, returning home from school for his father’s birthday to illustrate the transition from the city proper (Dresden) to the ‘Turmviertel’ so that the reader can understand how the State and the Party occupy clearly demarcated spaces in the cityscape.\(^{344}\) In addition to the descriptive passages contrived by the plot, Tellkamp actively encourages familiarity and visual understanding of the geography and layout of the area in which the story takes place by cartographically depicting what Clarke calls the ‘major sites of the narrative’\(^{345}\) in maps, included in the inlay of his book.

The inhabitants of ‘Turmviertel’ are the ‘Bildungsbügertum’—recognised historically (outside the primary text) as the German learned and academic elites,\(^{346}\) or bourgeoisie. Each protagonist in Der Turm inhabits the cityscape ‘not only in particular spatial terms, but also from a distinct standpoint with regard to the temporal.’\(^{347}\) This is exemplified by Florian, a second-hand bookseller, who, to escape from the realities of the present, ‘spends much of the narrative in a kind of contemplative trance which arises from his reception of poetry, art and music.’\(^{348}\) Clarke elaborates on the significance of Florian’s existential choices:

> In this sense, the bookshop where he spends his time and where he often enters his trance-like state is a chronotope in the Bakhtinian sense: an experience of place which is simultaneously a subjective experience of historical time, or rather the escape from historical time.\(^{349}\)

Although Florian is inadvertently a resident of the ‘Turmviertel’, and is therefore under the auspices of its totalitarian regime, he is still able to create a private and non-secular space inside the bookshop, which allows him to mentally escape the harsh external realities of his life. Essentially, the bookshop is a micro-chronotope: hidden,

---


\(^{345}\) Clarke, “Space, Time and Power,” 492.

\(^{346}\) Georg Bollenbeck, “German Kultur, the Bildungsbügertum, and its Susceptibility to National Socialism,” *German Quarterly*, vol. 73, issue 1 (Winter 2000), 68.


\(^{348}\) Ibid., 495.

\(^{349}\) Ibid.
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contained, and subsumed within the macro-chronotope (or concrete chronotope) of his age and society. As Lily Alexander explains, architectural elements can become part of the narrative whole, and a radically shaped spatial landscape—such as the ‘Turmviertel’—affects ‘the drama of the characters—their ordeals, physical/psychological movement, the meaning of the journey, and spiritual survival.’ Tellkamp uses the major geographical and architectural sites in the narrative to make the confluent indices of human and historical life not only ‘graphically visible (space), but narratively visible (time)’—thereby entering the territory of visual storytelling.

Francisco Goldman is also aware of the imaginative power and resonance of visual storytelling and how clearly delineated spatial areas, such as landscapes, architecture and venue, can cause time to become palpable. As noted by Bakhtin, the chronotope ‘makes narrative events concrete, makes them take on flesh, causes blood to flow in their veins.’ (250). Like Tellkamp, Goldman provides a map of the entire geographical area where the major events in the narrative pertaining to Gerardi’s assassination took place. This map, entitled the ‘Neighborhood of the Murder’, covers an inner city area the size of more than twenty city blocks, and yet only marks out the Metropolitan Cathedral, the OHDA office and the Central Plaza park (which the Cathedral and OHDA offices face onto), the National Palace, the Presidential Residence and the church of San Sebastián, including the park and basketball court directly outside. Again, similarly to Tellkamp, whose graphic illustrations of the ‘Turmviertel’ equate to ‘something like a mental map of the city as it is experienced

351 Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 247.
by its central characters... Goldman’s city map has a sparse but focused economy of visual features, with each of its constituent graphical elements denoting a major site in the narrative, as experienced by the actors.

Phillip and Juliana Muehrcke argue that the exact duplication of a geographical setting is impossible, and that to read a map requires imagination because, ‘The map maker asks the map reader to believe that a mosaic of points, lines, and areas on a flat sheet of paper is equivalent to a multidimensional world in space and time.’ Further, they suggest that writers are attracted to maps because ‘they are so well acquainted with the limitations of written communication in dealing with forms, processes, and relationships in the space-time continuum.’ As they explain:

Written language is linear. It has a beginning and an end and between the two flows predictably, according to the rules of grammar. The subject of discourse is rarely as well ordered; rather, it is characterized by the simultaneous interaction of many factors. Maps, on the other hand, involve far less transcription from reality and less formatting than idioms do, primarily because the position of maps on the gradient between reality and abstraction is closer to reality. Maps appeal in a natural and logical way to our visual sense and to our need for conceptualization.

The map in The Art of Political Murder is not representative of the multidimensional world in space and time, and does not strictly correspond with reality. The map’s abstract mosaic of points and lines, and the selective depiction of buildings in the old district area of Guatemala City only makes sense in relation to the text. Essentially, Goldman’s ‘Neighborhood of the Murder’ map is a story map, that is, on the opposite end of the reality/abstraction spectrum to a functional land map. It is solely designed to complement the scene-by-scene construction of the murder by helping the reader.
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overcome difficulties in conceptualising the narrative’s ‘forms, processes, and relationships in the space-time continuum.’

By looking at Goldman’s description of the events leading up to the murder, and the level of detail used to portray the spatial environment, it becomes clear why a visual aid, such as a map, is useful for the reader. For instance:

So a few minutes before ten, Bishop Gerardi drove up Second Street and turned left into the driveway that runs between the San Sebastián complex and a tree-filled park. The complex includes, in a row, a Catholic building, the parish house, the garage, and the church. The park is traversed by a paved walkway leading from the Sixth Avenue to the raised plaza in front of the church doors. At night, the park is dark and quiet, and the neighborhood, which bustles by day, because it is so close to the downtown business area and government buildings, is mostly deserted. Shops were shuttered, offices and school buildings were empty, and the heavy wooden doors of faded residences were securely locked. San Sebastián is an old parish, dating nearly to the founding of the city in the late eighteenth century, but the church itself, which is of modest size, with two bell towers, one at each corner, was twice destroyed by earthquakes and twice rebuilt during the past century. A remnant of the colonial era, a statue of the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén, her crest pierced by the numerous swords, her pale polychrome face ethereally sad, lips parted to expel a gentle sigh of pain, stands in a side chapel. (27).

This example shows how the spatial environment is fused with the temporal progression of the narrative. The passage begins, ‘So a few minutes before ten, Bishop Gerardi drove up…’, and then provides an account of the exact route he took to get back to his living quarters, in the San Sebastián Parish House. Jonathon Culler has explained that Russian Formalism makes a distinction between histoire (referring to the sequence of completed events—which, from this point onwards, will be used to refer to the actual sequence of completed events as they occurred in the past) and récit (the presentation or emplotment of events). Goldman’s description of Bishop Gerardi’s trip home—the récit—only lasts one sentence before the narrative describes the area that Gerardi travelled through on the night of his murder. From the second sentence onwards in this passage, the narrative provides information on the parish’s
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history and locale; the church’s design and façade; and the visual aspects of the statue of the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén.

Once the récit ends, when Gerardi turns off the road and onto the driveway leading to San Sebastián church, the tense switches from the simple past tense—used to refer to the completed actions (or histoire)—into the simple present tense that Goldman uses to depict the setting on that night. In this descriptive passage, Goldman uses a different tense to that used for the récit because he cannot truthfully claim to know what the park looked like on the actual night of the murder, as he was not there. Instead, Goldman uses the present tense—which is the ‘Now time of utterance…’—to describe the park on a typical night. This switch in tense is a strategy Bakhtin refers to as ‘ancillary time.’ (248). Ancillary time is a ‘viscous and sticky time that drags itself slowly through space…’ (248) and is interwoven with ‘other noncyclical temporal sequences or used merely to intersperse such sequences; it often serves as a contrasting background for temporal sequences that are more charged with energy and event.’ (248). The charged temporal sequences in this passage are the events depicted in the récit of Gerardi returning home. Goldman has interwoven ancillary time into the récit (where ‘time takes precedence over space…’), effectively pausing his scene-by-scene account so that the narrative can discursively depict the spatial environment where the events took place. This has the effect of making space dominate time.

Ancillary time thus comes into effect from the start of the second sentence of this passage, when the narrator details the layout of the complex in a matter-of-fact way. The narrator becomes slightly more descriptive in the fourth sentence,
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describing the park as ‘dark and quiet’ at night compared to the ‘bustles by day’. However, it is clear from the start of this sentence that the narrator is depicting a typical night, rather than the actual night of the murder because the prepositional phrase ‘At night’ indicates a general position in time and not a finite occasion in the histoire. In the next sentence, the area surrounding the complex is characterised as desolate and guarded: shuttered shops; empty office buildings; and securely locked doors on the residences, which creates the impression that Gerardi was isolated and forsaken. Intriguingly, this sentence is written in the past tense—the ‘Shops were [my italics] shuttered, offices and school buildings were [ibid] empty...’—unlike the rest of the descriptive passage, and implies that the narrator is describing this area on the night of the murder even though it is more likely that this is a depiction of how Goldman presumes it to have been on that night based on his knowledge of the local area and what it is like at night.

Erich Auerbach has described how the Roman historian Tacitus fictionalised a speech by Percennius to cast light on the grievances of mutinous soldiers, such as the long length of their service, insufficient pay, corruption, and abuse. The reasons for Tacitus choosing to simulate Percennius making a speech about infantry conditions, instead of simply discussing the matter himself, were ‘purely aesthetic...’ according to Auerbach. As a senator and historian of the Roman Empire, Tacitus had the characteristic attitude of ‘aristocratic conservatism’, which meant that he was unequivocally opposed to sedition of any sort against the Empire. Percennius, as the ringleader of the mutiny, was a figure that he could use to represent what Tacitus believed to be the worst elements in Roman society at the time. Auerbach explains
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that these ‘grandiloquent speeches’\textsuperscript{364} were popular in ancient history and that their ‘function is graphic dramatization (\textit{illustratio}) of a given occurrence, or at times the presentation of great political or moral ideas; in either case they are intended as the rhetorical bravura pieces of the presentation.’\textsuperscript{365}

Although Goldman does not fabricate dialogue to fulfil his political agenda, in the final two sentences in the passage above he modifies the tense—from the simple past to the past continuous and then back to the simple past—in order to manipulate the presentation of the spatial environment so that it functions as the graphic dramatization of the \textit{récit}. In the penultimate sentence, starting ‘San Sebastián is an old parish…’, the tense returns once again to the simple present that was used at the start of the switch to ancillary time. Information is provided about the founding of the parish of San Sebastián, the size of the church, and the destruction of its two bell towers. In this way, the narrative suffuses the church with a sense of time, not only the present (how it looks now) but also the past (how it has changed), so that the building becomes ‘materialized history’\textsuperscript{366}. However, it is not until the final sentence of the passage that the spatial settings mark the past, present \textit{and} the ‘press of the future.’\textsuperscript{367} The sentence begins by revealing the historical period in which the statue of the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén was created—‘A remnant of the colonial era…’—and then details how her chest is pierced by swords, her face is sad and pale, and her lips are ‘parted to expel a gentle sigh of pain…. ’ This acute focus on the salient features of the statue marks the apogee of the graphic dramatization of space in this passage. Having paused the temporal progression of the \textit{récit} with ancillary time and manipulated the representation of the environment so that Gerardi appears shut
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out from society, Goldman begins to emphasise the legacy of Catholicism in Guatemala by mentioning that the parish dates back ‘nearly to the founding of the city…’ and that the Church’s two bell towers were rebuilt twice in the past century, indicating that it has endured (and overcome) many challenges in its history.

In the final sentence, Goldman builds on this motif of legacy and endurance by using the icon of the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén (‘A remnant of the colonial era…’) to symbolise persecution against the pure and innocent and act as a metaphor for Gerardi’s impending doom by exposing an antecedence of violence against holy figures in Central America. This revelation (of the past) transforms the significance of the récit (the present moment) by foreshadowing the imminent cataclysm (the future)—fusing past, present and future into ‘one carefully thought out, concrete whole.’

Ultimately, the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén communicates a sense of the ‘fully fleshed chronotope’ of the text and illustrates how the landscape—the park, the buildings, the statue—have been used to make the social, historic, and perhaps even the spiritual significance of this murder graphically visible.

From the very first pages of *The Art of Political Murder*, it is clear that Goldman intends to conceptualise every aspect of this murder: as a human and social tragedy; as the malevolent consequence of escalating tensions between the military ruling elite and the Church; and finally as a watershed moment in the establishment of law and democracy in Guatemala. On the first page, Goldman provides a portrait of a warm and affectionate looking elderly man—the quintessential grandfather-figure—identified in the caption below as ‘Bishop Juan Gerardi Conedera (1922-1998)’ (1), making it apparent that the man in this photo will be the focal point of the text.
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Roland Barthes has said that language is, by its nature, fictional, and that the ‘attempt to render language unfictional requires an enormous apparatus of measurements: we convoke logic, or, lacking that, sworn oath: but the Photograph is indifferent to all intermediaries: it does not invent; it is authentication itself; the (rare) artifices it permits are not probative; they are, on the contrary, trick pictures…’

Barthes’ basic argument is that the photo is intended to ratify what it presents; no writing can give this kind of certainty. Therefore, in presenting the portrait first, before the narrative, attention is drawn to Gerardi’s true existence, his beneficent appearance and (in conjunction with the title, ‘THE MURDER’, and odious date, ‘APRIL 26, 1998’, prominently inscribed in capitals on the next page) a life taken—precipitating the requisite emotional response from the reader before the story has even begun. The narrative then opens with the récit, on the third page:

ONE SUNDAY AFTERNOON, a few hours before he was bludgeoned to death in the garage of the parish house in the church of San Sebastián, in the old center of Guatemala City, Bishop Juan Gerardi Conedera was drinking scotch and telling stories in a friend’s backyard garden. Bishop Gerardi’s stories were famously amusing and sometimes off-color. He had a reputation as a chistoso, a joker. “In a meeting with him, you would get his whole repertoire of jokes,” Father Mario Orantes Nájera, the parish’s assistant priest, told police investigators two days later. “I wish you could have known him.” Guatemalans admire someone who can tell chistes. A good chiste is, among other things, a defense against fear, despair, and the loneliness of not daring to speak their mind. (3)

By starting the narrative with this scene of Gerardi drinking scotch and telling jokes, the first impressions of the Bishop are of a sociable man with a natural affinity for people—“I wish you could have known him,” Father Mario Orantes Nájera is quoted as saying when he was arrested in connection with the murder—which neatly corresponds to the portrait two pages earlier. Gerardi’s enjoyment of chistes and the reasons why chistes and chistosos are so highly valued in Guatemalan society provide
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Goldman’s segue into the background of the country’s troubled history; its impact on the national character; and why Gerardi served the Catholic Church, protecting those threatened, displaced or otherwise impoverished by the military regime. This first chapter is structured so that the narrative neatly flows from the scene in the garden into a commentary about the country’s history and Gerardi’s ecclesiastical work over the years. It eventually leads to the release of *Guatemala: Never Again*, conveying the significance of this report for that fateful day in April 1998. This cycle of scene-by-scene construction and exposition, which continues throughout *The Art of Political Murder*, explains and contextualises the *récit* so as to give the reader a comprehensive understanding of the events. David Eason explains that in RLJ, making phenomena comprehensible to ‘the outside world’ involves more than merely describing a scene and the actors’ experiences: it must be explained through reference to a social, cultural or historical framework.

The contextualisation of the *récit* demands selective interpretation of the *histoire* even when a journalist takes elaborate measures to depict the events exactly as they occurred in the past. As Terence Hawkes writes, ‘When a man perceives the world, he perceives, without knowing it, the superimposed shape of his own mind, and the entities can only be meaningful (or ‘true’) in so far as they find a place within that shape.’ This is the reason why Bakhtin claimed that in written composition, ‘we will always arrive, in the final analysis, at the human voice, which is to say we come up against the human being.’ However, realist literature ‘tends to conceal the
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socially relative or constructed nature of language: it helps to confirm the prejudice that there is a form of “ordinary” language which is somehow natural.\textsuperscript{376}

Gérard Genette reveals how ‘vraisemblance’ (verisimilitude) and propriety are joined together ‘under a single criterion, namely “whatever is conformable to public opinion”….\textsuperscript{377} This opinion, irrespective of whether it is real or supposed, ‘is almost exactly what would be called today an ideology—in other words, a body of maxims and presuppositions that constitutes, simultaneously, a vision of the world and a system of values.’\textsuperscript{378} RLJ avoids calling attention to the way it requires the selection and interpretation of past events by asserting conventions of invisibility and naturalness.\textsuperscript{379} In order to create the ‘illusion’ of reality, Genette argues, each narrative unit must have the right value (from the viewpoint of narrative economy) to warrant inclusion. A narrative unit’s value can be determined by the subtraction of ‘function’ (F) from ‘motivation’ (M), or: $V = F - M$. ‘If its function is (roughly speaking) what it is used for,’ Genette says, ‘its motivation is what it needs to disguise its function.’\textsuperscript{380} The perfect (realist) narrative unit has zero motivation—or at least only an implicit motivation based on its function in the text, meaning that there is no real need to disguise or justify its presence. This type of narrative unit would have the formula: $V = F - zero$; or simply: $V = F$. In these circumstances, the writer is appointing the ‘because’ to ‘make one forget the why?—and so to naturalize, or realize (in the sense of: to make pass for real) fiction while dissimulating what has
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been “pre-arranged” in it…in other words what is artificial—fictive, in short.”

This absence of motivation as motivation is the basis of realism’s aesthetic style.

In RLJ, environment, landscape and architecture are such effective rhetorical and ideological instruments because their inclusion in the narrative appears to have zero motivation. The narrative value of spatial depictions is underwritten by their requirement for the reader’s understanding of the récit. However, as exemplified by Goldman, the writer can manipulate the representation of space so that it intimates the social, cultural and historical framework of the récit—viz., the chronotope. Deborah Mutnick argues that the chronotope reveals a writer’s social point of view by the way in which constituent parts of reality are composed and then re-presented through language. This is demonstrated in the paragraph immediately following the description of the statue of the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén. In this passage, Goldman expands on his description of the parish of San Sebastián and describes how it sits in relation to the other buildings that feature in the ‘Neighborhood of the Murder’ map:

A dead-end side street, Callejón del Manchén, extends two blocks, between Third and Fifth streets, from alongside the church of San Sebastián to the rear of the old National Palace. At the intersections of Callejón del Manchén and Fourth and Fifth streets, guarded security gates protect the presidential residence, which is situated between them. The very wealthy and patrician President Arzú, who is descended from Spanish colonial viceroys and archbishops, was the first Guatemalan president to choose to live in his own home instead of in the presidential residence, which was being used for business and formal ceremonies. Also inside those gates were the headquarters of the Guatemalan Army’s Presidential Guard and the Estado Mayor Presidencial (EMP)...In recent decades there was probably no city block in all of Central America more forbidding or generally feared than that one on Callejón del Manchén...Looming on the other side of Fourth Street, just outside the gates and only 200 feet from the church, is the modern white-concrete and black-glass multi-story building of the Secretariat of Strategic Analysis (SAE), a government information-gathering agency that up until 1998, at least, was also integrated into the military’s intelligence structure.

So the church of San Sebastián is located in an interesting neighborhood, inside an Army security parameter...
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…the park was also a place where tribes of teenagers and small gangs of delinquents staked out and sometimes fought over territory—tough high school kids, heavy-metal rockeros, petty thieves, pushiteros who sold drugs, and even a gang of druggy alleged satanists who always wore black and who sometimes burst into the church to interrupt Masses, shouting obscenities…It was naturally assumed, given the character of the neighborhood, and its nearness to the seat of government and military security and intelligence installations, that some of the park’s denizens, the vendors, shoe-shine men, car washers, and petty criminals, must be orejas—ears. (27-9)

The first noticeable feature of this passage is that the narrative lacks any discernible récit. The focus is entirely on the spatial environment: the geographical setting of Gerardi’s church; its proximity, and how it is situated in relation to, the seat of power; and, finally, how the park is inhabited by a threatening mix of antisocial groups, possibly including government informants spying on the church.

According to James Lawson, the ‘root character of narrative is linear, for while multiple activities, processes, or developments may exist all at once as causal forces, they can never be narrated all at once. Author and reader must therefore “walk” together along a narrative “path”, if the narrative is to evoke a geography.’

As the récit effectively pauses in the previous paragraph when Gerardi turns left off Second Street and drives into the church complex, this is the logical location for Goldman to begin his spatial depiction of the area. He then traces a narrative path south, along the Callejón del Manchén, ‘walking’ the reader past the guarded security points, the presidential residence, and all the other buildings depicted on the map, from top to bottom. Whereas Tellkamp used Christian’s journey home for his father’s birthday to obscure the motivations for his description of the cityscape, Goldman only needs to mention that ‘there was probably no city block in all of Central America more forbidding or generally feared than that one on Callejón del Manchén…’ to justify the inclusion of this passage in the narrative. In fact, this passage is motivated
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by Goldman’s desire to represent the significance of the church’s location in ‘an Army parameter.’ (28).

Michael Chanan explains that, in documentary filmmaking, a shot is not so much a discrete strip of film or tape but the outcome of a process: ‘the result of discovering, capturing, selecting and arranging appropriate elements to be found within actually existing social-historical space.’ 385 He reveals that in this process ‘the documentarist discovers that representational space is highly malleable, for it includes people, places, events, the results of the provocations of the camera, and already existing images of every sort.’ 386 The narrative in The Art of Political Murder illustrates Goldman’s awareness of the malleability of representational space. The narrative ‘path’ (constructed above) evokes a geographical area that is externally verifiable but also a product of the internal mind, illustrating the power of the individual consciousness to perceive pattern in experience. 387 This is why Bakhtin implores readers to recognise the sharp and categorical boundary line between the actual world—as a source of representation—and the world represented in the text. As he says: ‘We must never forget this, we must never confuse—as has been done up to now and as is still often done—the represented world with the world outside the text (naïve realism); nor must we confuse the author/creator of a work with the author as a human being (naïve biographism)...All such confusions are methodologically impermissible.’ (253).

It is clear from the passage above that Goldman has used space as a motif for containment and isolation, creating the sense that the church of San Sebastián is cordoned off by the military and alienated from the rest of society due to its proximity
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to government buildings, military installations and the park, which is plagued with thieves, drug dealers, addicts and Satanists who harass, intimidate and spy on the church. The church, as a micro-chronotope, offers no safety from the forces of evil, either in the past (as illustrated by the Virgin of Sorrows of Manchén) or in the present (as proven by Gerardi’s assassination). Its location, within the macro-chronotope of modern Guatemalan society, indicates that it is neither trusted (spying), connected with society (the military cordon) nor safe (‘no city block in all of Central America more forbidding or generally feared…’). Together, the micro- and macro-chronotopes reveal Goldman’s view that the church and the army were ‘into their bitterest confrontation since the eighteen-seventies…’ and that the church was in a deeply precarious position, which has implications not only for the current generation but for future generations as well.

_The Art of Political Murder_ exemplifies how externally verifiable inanimate objects, such as roads, buildings and statues, can be ordered and arranged in a rhetorically meaningful way in a narrative. Hayden White argues that the ‘value attached to narrativity in the representation of real events arises out of a desire to have real events display the coherence, integrity and closure of an image of life that is and can only be imaginary.’ This text has been chosen as the third and final RLJ text to be analysed in this thesis due to Goldman’s failure to at least acknowledge this point. While Goldman is relatively open minded about the intrigue involving Father Mario Orantes, Ana Lucía Escobar and the Valle del Sol gang, his confidence that Gerardi was politically assassinated is completely unwavering. Of course, his case against the EMP and the military establishment is extremely convincing, and it is perfectly
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acceptable for him to assert this theory during the expository sections of the text because the narration is identifiable-independent and the reader can recognise that the information is coming from a particular viewpoint. The text is ultimately problematic, however, because Goldman allows his assumptions about the crime and the political situation in general to completely colour every aspect of his RLJ depiction of the murder and the location where it took place. He does not acknowledge that incorporating documentary evidence in narrative by necessity includes ‘subjective interpretation and selectivity.’ In this sense, The Art of Political Murder should serve as a warning to readers because Goldman has used this mode of literary journalism to asseverate a highly politicised representation of reality as if it were ontologically indisputable.

PART III
MODERNIST LITERARY JOURNALISM
The First Stone

Helen Garner’s *The First Stone* has been chosen as the first modernist text to be analysed in this thesis because it is ‘a work of personal journalism which can be likened to a novel with an unreliable narrator.’

Indeed, it is precisely because so many critics and commentators have questioned the appropriateness of Helen Garner’s subjective style and personal approach in *The First Stone* that it serves as a useful paradigm for investigating the advantages and disadvantages of MLJ. Kerryn Goldsworthy, for instance, suggests that Garner took huge risks in deliberately undermining the text’s authority by ‘foregrounding her own subjectivity (in both senses of the word) as the storyteller…’.

Similarly, Virginia Trioli argues that while Garner’s ‘idiosyncratic, personal approach…’ is appealing to read, it is also the book’s greatest flaw. Expanding on this point, she suggests that Garner’s insistence on ‘seeing all non-violent interaction between men and women through a strictly personal lens of what seemed reasonable (or not) to her,’ enabled her to reject ‘issues of institutional patriarchy and abuses of power…as the dogmatic bleatings of victim feminists.’

Mark Davis also criticises what he considers to be an inherent bias in this work, suggesting that the two female students at the centre of the scandal in *The First Stone* are vilified for ‘not taking direct action against the master…[and]…adopting a punitive, legislative approach in going to the police and
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participating in an ideologically driven feminist cabal designed to orchestrate the master’s dismissal.  

Yet another critic, Matthew Ricketson, labels Garner’s strategy of shifting the heart of the inquiry away from Ormond College and locating it ‘inside herself’ as ‘dubious’. Referring to this strategy as ‘Refracting an issue through your own prism…’, Ricketson says that it encouraged the media to focus on Garner rather than the issues of sexual harassment and ‘helps explain why argument is subordinated to emotion in The First Stone’. Garner herself acknowledges the significant role that emotion plays in her work, revealing that she intended to write ‘in such a way as to invite people to lay down their guns for a moment and think again—and not only think, but feel again.’ For Ricketson, though, Garner demonstrates neither adequate research nor carefully weighted argument, offering readers ‘a view that is, at best, partial.’ Finally, Janet Malcolm argues that Garner’s ‘obsessive pursuit’ of the two complainants and their steadfast refusal to speak with her is in fact the main action of the book. Malcolm suggests that, since Garner does not manage to ‘shatter the Cordelia-like silence’ of the two students, she subsequently fails to realise her main aim in writing the book, which was to write a ‘truthful, calm and balanced account of what happened…’; instead, she is forced to produce an ‘almost
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vertiginously turbulent narrative….405 This conflicting aspect of the narrative has resulted in a text that displays the influence of the ideals of both rationalism and romanticism, which is why, like The Art of Political Murder, it is located near the centre of Webb’s continuum.

These criticisms challenge the appropriateness of Garner’s decision to write what she describes as a ‘less “objective”, more personal book…’406, one with more questions than answers407 and one that declines to ‘present itself as one big clonking armour-clad monolithic certainty…’408 David Eason describes how the modernist reporter ‘explores the reality that actor and spectator create in their interaction’ and ‘the dynamics through which each is created in the reporting process.’409 Eason notes that the most extended treatment of the relationship between observed and lived experience can be found in John Gregory’s Vegas, in which the author explores ‘the psychological motivation for his reporting and considers the ethical dilemmas implicit in creating worlds for anonymous readers.’410 Garner displays a similar impulse in The First Stone, agonising over her own motivation and justification for her reporting style in this story in a way that borders on a crisis. This chapter will examine the ethical dilemmas involved in Garner’s self-reflexive and ‘compassionately involved point of view’411 to determine whether this characteristically modernist approach affects her claims to facticity.

Janet Malcolm summarises The First Stone as a book that documents Helen Garner’s ‘thwarted attempts at writing a “quiet, thoughtful account” of a case of
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sexual assault…’\textsuperscript{412} at Ormond College, the largest residential college at The University of Melbourne, Australia. The case became public knowledge on 14 March 1992 when \textit{Age} journalist Simon Mann reported that the master of Ormond College, Dr Alan Gregory, was ‘under pressure to resign from the prestigious residential college…over three separate allegations of sexual harassment.’\textsuperscript{413} The alleged incidents had occurred on 16 October 1991 at an end-of-year student party called the ‘Smoko’ that was held after the college’s annual valedictory dinner.\textsuperscript{414} The day after the party, an informal complaint was made to Dr Jenna Mead, convener and chair of the Ormond College Committee for Equal Opportunity and member of the Ormond College Council.\textsuperscript{415} On 25 November, an intermediary acting on behalf of two female students went to see the chairman of the Ormond College Council, High Court Judge Sir Daryl Dawson, to make a complaint of sexual harassment against Dr Gregory. Acting on Sir Daryl Dawson’s precept, in February 1992 the College Council formed a subcommittee, known as the ‘Group of Three’, which was instructed to handle the issue. In March of that year, having concluded its investigation, the ‘Group of Three’ released a statement ‘saying that while it believed that the students involved had acted in “good faith”, it affirmed confidence in the Master.’\textsuperscript{416}

Dissatisfied with this ruling, the complainants decided to report the matter to the police, and in May 1992, ‘the police laid two charges of indecent assault against Dr Gregory.’\textsuperscript{417} Between August and September, Dr Gregory appeared at the Magistrates Court in Melbourne several times to defend himself against the
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Magistrate Mr. Maurice Gurvich dismissed the charge that Dr Gregory had assaulted a female student (known pseudonymously in *The First Stone* as Elizabeth Rosen to protect her identity) in his locked office. However, Deputy Chief Magistrate Bryan Clothier found Dr Gregory guilty of repeatedly squeezing the breasts of Nicole Stewart (another pseudonym) while they danced together at the ‘Smoko’, a charge which was later set aside on appeal in the County Court. Six months later, in March 1993, Ormond College reached a confidential settlement with the complainants in an agreement arbitrated by the Equal Opportunity Commission and ‘paid damages to the two women, and issued a statement saying the complaints could have been handled “with more sensitivity and a greater degree of apparent impartiality”’. Two months later, Ormond College accepted Dr Gregory’s offer of resignation ‘with regret’.

The timeline of *The First Stone* starts *in media res*, at the point when Rosen and Stewart have already given statements to the police. The book begins by stating that ‘Around lunchtime on Thursday 9 April 1992, a man called Dr Colin Shepherd went to the police station in the inner Melbourne suburb of Carlton.’ The reader is informed that ‘In the CIB office there, he had this interview with two detectives.’ The distal demonstrative adverb ‘there’ is linked to the proximal demonstrative noun phrase ‘this interview’ to draw the interlocutor’s focus from the CIB office itself to the conversation that took place inside it. It is clear from the fact that the interview is recounted verbatim for the next thirteen pages until the end of the chapter, that Garner has possession of a copy of the transcript. Linking the distal demonstrative adverb
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‘there’ with the proximal demonstrative noun phrase ‘this interview’ means that she can provide a seamless account of this event without drawing attention to this piece of documentary material. While this paragraph establishes the context of the interview, it does not explain whom Dr Shepherd (the pseudonym for Dr Gregory) is or why he has turned up to speak to the police. The paragraph is also written in what Risto Kunelius refers to as ‘the “own” voice of the news text, an independent and transparent narrator at work’ due to its stating of the facts in an anonymous and omniscient voice that ‘is set “above” the world it narrates.’

In Kunelius’ model, an interview is usually categorised as having a transparent-dependent narrative voice because, by repeating the utterances (and thus the discourse) of the actors, the narrator ‘works almost solely as the necessary technical device that brings about the voice of the actor…’ However, the discourse deixis in the preceding paragraph demonstrates that the interview in chapter one is not part of the narrator’s discourse. Francis Cornish explains that discourse deixis ‘involves setting up a figure (the intended discourse referent) from within the ground in which it is embedded, and signalling that this figure is to be the subject of the subsequent discourse.’ The proximal demonstrative noun phrase ‘this’ sets up the interview (the figure) as the intended discourse referent from within the narrative, signalling that a discursive shift is imminent, and that the interview is set to become the subject of the subsequent discourse. Dr Shepherd is also described as having ‘had’ [my italics] this conversation with two detectives.’ (1). The pluperfect ‘had’ establishes that the actual utterances of this interview had occurred in the past, that is,
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before the act of narration. This is in contradistinction to the interview itself, which is in the present tense with no authorial intrusion or descriptive details of any sort accompanying the dialogue, which strongly implies that the interview is a copy of a transcript embedded into the text. The inclusion of a verbatim record of the interview removes the need for a technical device to bring out the actors’ voices; and the interview itself, therefore, has no bearing on the narrator’s voice because the dialogue is in ‘a form in which the actors themselves, and not the primary narrator, utter the language.’

The combination of a ‘non-narrative embedded text’ and a transparent-independent narrator who ‘builds a narrative level “above” the events, issues, and persons it described...[and]... gives a “realistic” hierarchy to the text...’ means that this opening chapter of The First Stone is inconsistent with MLJ’s style. In fact, chapter one has clearly been influenced by the assumptions of rationalism and should be located closer to RLJ on Joseph M. Webb’s continuum. The reason why this chapter has been written in this style becomes clearer at the start of chapter two, which begins with Garner’s description of her own reaction to a report in the Age concerning Dr Shepherd’s arraignment at the Melbourne Magistrates court:

One morning in August 1992 I opened the Age at breakfast time and read that a man I have never heard of, the Master of Ormond College, was up before a magistrate on a charge of indecent assault: a student had accused him of having put his hand on her breast while they were dancing.

I still remember the jolt I got from the desolate little item: Has the world come to this? All morning at work I kept thinking about it. I got on the phone to women friends of my age, feminists pushing fifty. They had all noticed the item and had been unsettled by it. ‘He touched her breast and she went to the cops? My God – why didn’t she get her mother or her friend to deal with it at the time?’ And then someone said what no doubt we had all been thinking: ‘Look – if every bastard who’s ever laid a hand on us were dragged into court, the judicial system of the state would be clogged for years.’

At this we laughed, in scornful shrieks. (15)

---
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In this passage, it is apparent from the repeated use of the personal pronoun ‘I’ that the narrative voice is no longer that of a transparent-independent narrator but is now a ‘specific person, telling the story in a specific situation at a specific moment.’ Kerryn Goldworthy describes this transition as a ‘dramatic discursive shift’, ‘where the formal, stilted formula language of the police transcript gives way to the frankly personal.’

What Garner has done is switch from RLJ in chapter one to MLJ in chapter two for rhetorical effect. The first chapter is essentially a rather clinical portrayal of Dr Shepherd’s initial exchange with the police. The transparent-independent narrator offers the circumstantial information in a matter-of-fact way before moving on to a supporting piece of documentary material. As Kunelius explains, this type of narrative structure ‘is often applied in the so-called “hard” news, dealing with “serious” matters.’ This structure is then juxtaposed with an identifiable-dependent narrator structure which allows Garner and her friend to react to the newspaper report of the event (at the start of chapter two) and ‘invites the reader to observe the performers and assess their performance.’ These opposing narrative voices, entailing different modes of literary journalism, allow Garner to highlight Dr Shepherd's plight by setting it against the sympathetic opinions of a group of middle-aged women, thereby setting the tone for the rest of the book.

A further correlation between these two early chapters is the role that their narrative voices suggest for the narratee. As previously mentioned, chapter one and two display transparent-independent and identifiable-dependent narrative voices,
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respectively. Although these two voices are situated at opposite ends of Kunelius’ narrative force field, they have the same role for the narratee: ‘spectator’. The narrative voice in chapter one implies a ‘spectator’ role for the narratee because it ‘sets the stage for different actors…’ to speak. The emphasis of the spectator ‘is on the “contents” and “facts” presented by the actors and their performance…’ The narrative voice in chapter two infers the same narratee role but for a slightly different reason. Here, the audience is ‘set apart from the dialogue between the performing narrator (n) and the actor…and the narrator implies its own involvement in the narration and thus implies that the viewpoint presented is not of a “general” nature.’ The main difference between a ‘spectator’ and ‘listener’ (the other principal narratee role) is that in the latter ‘the audience is a recognized party in the communication, both in terms of form and content…and is expected to listen quietly…’ Moreover, in narratives where the narratee role is a listener, the narrator addresses its ‘audience in a rather more active and intense manner than the ones orientated towards a “spectator”’. In contrast, when the narratee is a spectator, the reader takes on a more passive role and is encouraged to either focus on the facts and contents of the report and the performance of the actors, on the one hand, or on the ‘performing narrator’ and his or her involvement in the narrative, on the other. Garner has in fact utilised both of these to encourage the reader to first focus on the particulars of the case—what Dr Shepherd is accused of and what he says in his defence—and then to observe Garner and her friend’s reaction to it. The audience is neither recognised as a party in the communication nor directly addressed in either

435 Ibid., 259.
436 Ibid.
437 Ibid.
438 Ibid., 259-60.
439 Ibid., 260.
chapter. Garner simply states the facts of the interview and then depicts an event where she and her friends express their opinions, an approach that enables her to subtly influence her readers without having to openly persuade them.

Although the two narrators in these chapters imply the same role for the narratee (albeit for different reasons), their entirely different modes of expression can be compared to the distinction Emile Benveniste made concerning the personal and impersonal use of language. He observed that in French there are ‘two tenses to refer to the past, the perfect (passé composé) and the aorist (passé simple)...’ and he linked these two systems of tense to ‘show two different planes of utterance...’ namely, histoire and discours. Histoire, he noted, is reserved for written language and the narration of past events and is always composed in the third-person (206-7). In contrast, discours refers to ‘the mass of writing that reproduces oral discourse or that borrows its manner of expression and its purposes...[from]...all the genres in which someone addresses himself to someone, proclaims himself as speaker, and organizes what he says in the category of person.’ (209). According to this theory, chapter one is written as histoire because it is ‘presented without any intervention of the speaker in the narration...’ (206)—no authorial intrusion—and appears in the passé simple (‘the moment of the event’ (210)). Chapter two constitutes discours because the ‘relationship of person’ (209) is evident in the use of personal pronouns, evaluative expressions (‘I still remember the jolt I got from the desolate little item [my italics]...’), and the depiction of internal thought processes (‘Has the world come to this?’).
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According to Benveniste, many first-person narratives use the perfect tense (passé composé), which ‘creates a living connection between the past event and the present in which its evocation takes place.’ (210). The passage from chapter two presented above uses the perfect tense only fleetingly; for example: ‘They had all noticed…’ (past perfect) and ‘…what no doubt we had all been thinking…’ (past perfect continuous). A number of other tenses are used as well, such as: the simple past (‘…I opened the Age…’), present continuous (‘I still remember…’) and past continuous (‘All morning I kept thinking about it…’). Benveniste proposes that the only tense excluded from discours is the ‘aorist’, which is unique to histoire. (211). Despite the variety of tenses represented in this passage, the connection between past events and the present is still evident; for instance, one of Garner’s friends is quoted as saying: ‘He touched her breasts and she went to the cops?’ The italicisation of the word ‘cops’ is an illocutionary-force indicating device (IFID) that puts ‘the speaker on record as engaged in one rather than another kind of activity using language.’

According to N.G. Fotion, IFIDs ‘tell us whether the speaker is stating, describing, promising, requesting, sentencing, commending, commanding and other things.’ On this occasion, the prosodic stress on the word ‘cops’ puts Garner’s friend on record as having expressed her dismay at the students’ decision to involve the police. By evoking this assertive illocutionary act, Garner connects the past (how she interpreted the utterance at the time) to the present (how she represents her interpretation in ‘the moment of the discourse’).

This interplay between past and present is integral to Benveniste’s proposition that the narrator in first-person narratives, by relating the facts as both a witness and a
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participant (210), is able to make the event ‘ring vividly in our ears and link it to the present...’ (210). This witness/participant dyad is evident throughout most of The First Stone (chapters one and sixteen are the only exceptions), with the narrator continually oscillating between one and the other. However, it is difficult to determine whether the narrator is a ‘witness’ or a ‘participant’ because the first-person locution in these chapters signals that the participant in the narrated event is the same person as the performer of the speech event. In other words, since the ‘I’ who writes coincides with the ‘I’ that is written about, they are taken to be one and the same thing. Yet, as Martin W. Huang points out, strictly speaking they are not the same because ‘the moment one thinks or writes about one’s self, that self has already become an “other” (a character), a phenomenon that arises from the paradoxical nature of self-writing...’ This split between these two ‘I’s (or, in this case, the ‘I’ that narrates and the ‘I’ that is narrated about) can be explained using Gérard Genette’s concept of the diegesis.

Genette says that ‘any event a narrative recounts is at a diegetic level immediately higher than the level at which the narrating act producing this narrative is placed.’ Therefore, the ‘I’ that narrates is located at the first diegetic level of the narrative, ‘outside’ the diegesis, that is, ‘extradiegetic’. The ‘I’ that is narrated about is at the next diegetic level, situated ‘inside this first narrative...’ and is thus ‘intradiegetic’. Narratologically speaking, Garner (the real person who is ‘out there’ in reality) is implicated in the text through two distinct entities—the extradiegetic narrator and the intradiegetic ‘other’—because ‘the levels of story and discourse are
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kept apart.’\textsuperscript{450} Remigius Bunia observes that, in factual narration, the extradiegetic narrator lives ‘in the same universe where factual stories take place….\textsuperscript{451} This term, therefore, refers to ‘a narrator “outside the diegesis” but not outside the spatiotemporal universe of the narration if that spatiotemporal universe is understood in terms of physics.’\textsuperscript{452} Bunia’s comments reveal the importance of acknowledging that, in the real world, the extradiegetic narrator exists in the same spatiotemporal universe as the actors and events narrated about. In contrast, within the narrative, Garner (the narrator) exists ‘outside’ of the world she describes, even though she is describing her own past experiences.

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan argues that a narrative text cannot ‘show or imitate the action it conveys, since all such texts are made of language, and language signifies without imitating.’\textsuperscript{453} It is the narrator’s function to mediate and convey information about the narrative world for the sake of the reader because, as Roland Barthes explains, ‘there can be no narrative without a narrator and a listener (or reader).’\textsuperscript{454} According to Monika Fludernik, the narrator’s mediation can be ‘mimetic as the result of there being a teller or chronicler (teller mode) or it can be focused through the consciousness of one of the characters in the novel (reflector mode).’\textsuperscript{455} In \textit{The First Stone}, chapter one is in ‘teller mode’ because, in typical RLJ fashion, it has an external narrator (EN) that never refers to itself explicitly, indicating ‘that the
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narrating agent does not figure in the fabula [the story] as an actor… 456 and proving that the EN’s mediation is not focused through the consciousness of one of the actors.

In all the other chapters (excluding chapter sixteen), the narrator’s use of the first-person locution indicates a character-bound narrator (CN) that it is ‘identified with… an actor in the fabula…’. 457 Although a CN has a quasi-symbiotic relationship with its corresponding diegetic entity (the ‘other’/‘I’), it can nonetheless act independently as a teller or chronicler. In fact, all of the chapters composed in 1st PP in this book are predominantly in the ‘teller mode’, and only occasionally in reflector mode, even though the CN is homodiegetic—‘the narrator is the same person as (homo) a protagonist on the story level (diegesis)...’ 458—and it is easy to mistake its mediation as being focused through the consciousness of its protagonist. However, as Mieke Bal explains, if a CN stands apart, observes the events and relates the story according to its point of view, it constitutes a ‘witness’. 459 The clearest illustration of this type of ‘witness’ narrator in The First Stone occurs when Garner goes to see Dr Shepherd’s trial at the Melbourne Magistrates court and describes what she sees there:

The footpath outside the court was thronged with camera crews and press photographers, cruising like sharks for meat. I was ashamed and walked away. As I stood on the corner of Russell and La Trobe Streets, a group of young women from the court drifted past me and waited at the lights. They were striking girls, stylish in an understated manner of middle-class university students; full-faced, red-lipped, long-haired, wearing flat heavy shoes. They moved on to the pedestrian crossing in loose formation, not speaking to each other. They looked vague and confused, as if they hadn’t yet grasped what had just happened. I wondered if the girl in the study, and the dancing one, were among them. For the first time I felt sorry for the young students. They were of an age to have been my daughters. I wondered who was looking after them, or advising them. I asked myself what advice I would have given them. I thought, They don’t know what to do next. (19-20)
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The narrator in this passage is in every sense a ‘witness’: it is a ‘peripheral first-person narrator’\(^{460}\) that observes and narrates about the activities of a group of young women outside the courthouse. It records what Tom Wolfe calls ‘status details’—‘everyday gestures, habits, manners, customs…and other symbolic details that might exist within a scene…’\(^{461}\)—such as the students’ red lipstick, long hair, as well as their ‘loose formation’ and ‘vague and confused’ manner. Collectively, these symbolic details are redolent both of the familiarity and the underlying tragedy of this scene, as the narrator depicts this stereotypical group of female students coming to terms with the magistrate’s decision to give Dr Shepherd ‘the benefit of the doubt…’ (19).

The CN in this passage restricts itself to its own internal perspective and appears to focus the narrative through the consciousness of the embodied ‘I’ at the scene. However, the narrator in this example is overt—it is clearly telling the story.\(^{462}\) Garner, as the narrator, is articulating her own views (‘I was ashamed and walked away…’) and making her ‘presence felt stylistically as well as on the metanarrative level…’\(^{463}\) by mentioning the significance of the occasion (‘For the first time [my italics] I felt sorry for the young students…’) and expressing her internal thought processes (‘I thought, They don’t know what to do next…’). The narrator is identifiable, and dependent but only to the extent that it is implicated in the diegesis by the ‘other’ ‘I’. This scene clearly passes through the medium of an ‘observing mind’\(^{464}\) although this cannot be an actor’s mind because the narrator’s use of the preterite suggests that the events ‘are “seen from behind,”’ which implies that the
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narrator “knows more” than its characters…”\textsuperscript{465} underlining ‘the clear (though unspecified) temporal distance that separates the narrating self from the experiencing self.’\textsuperscript{466} Garner’s ‘narrating self’ is describing what her ‘experiencing self’ thought and felt at the time, but this is ‘a retrospective vision, which can be understood as the perception of memories.’\textsuperscript{467} Garner is therefore narrating about her past life and her past viewpoints, revealing that this passage is in teller mode because, as Seymour Chatman explains, the narrator’s comments are not of the ‘same order as the character’s perceptions, even if he is reporting what he saw or felt “back then” when he was a character.’\textsuperscript{468}

When Garner becomes embroiled in a conversation with her friends at the start of chapter two, the narrator can no longer be described as a ‘witness’ because it is now actively involved in the events occurring in the narrative world. The narrator’s involvement is indisputable because when the conversation ends, it remarks: ‘At this we [my italics] laughed, in scornful shrieks…’ (15). The use of the subject pronoun ‘we’ is a clear admission by the narrator of its involvement, even though Garner’s comments are not actually recorded. Kunelius explains that this has a peculiar effect because the narrator has become an actor in its own narrative and doubles ‘as both the transparent, technical means of communication (N) and as a performer in the narrative (n); a performer acting in the same space and time with the other actors.’\textsuperscript{469} In other words, this type of CN is a ‘participant’—the other element of Benveniste’s dyad.
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CHAPTER 8: The First Stone

The only difference between a ‘witness’ CN and a ‘participant’ CN is the focalizor. Mieke Bal describes the focalizor as ‘the point from which the elements are viewed.’\(^{470}\) If the narrator is overt and therefore ‘perceptible’\(^ {471}\) (p) on a discursive level, it draws attention to the ‘Now anchoring point or point of reference of the telling…’\(^ {472}\), demonstrating that it is the focalizor (F). The formula for a ‘witness’ CN is: \(N(p) = F\). If, on the other hand, the narrative is focused through the consciousness of an intradiegetic agent, then the narrator—who is extradiegetic—cannot be the focalizor. For instance, in chapter two, Garner’s friend says: ‘He touched her breasts and she went to the \textit{cops}\?’ The use of the IFID (‘cops’) in this sentence allows all of the information concerning Garner’s perception and interpretation of her friend’s utterance to be contained within the framework of its narratorial representation. There is no point of reference of the telling because the narrator is neither describing how the friend emphasised the word ‘cops’ nor explaining what she meant by it. Instead, it is illustrated (shown) linguistically, indicating that the mediation is focused through the consciousness of Garner’s experiencing self because only she is capable of perceiving, feeling, and registering the intent of her friend’s comments as they are spoken. The experiencing self is therefore the subject of focalization because it is the point from which the elements are viewed, and the narrator’s mediation is in reflector mode.

This representation of the utterance can be broken down as follows: the voice is the friend’s; the perception of the utterance is Garner’s experiencing self—making it a character-bound focalizor (CF)\(^ {473}\); and the speaking agent is the CN. It is comprised of three basic elements: a speech act by an Agent (A); its perception by the
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CHAPTER 8: The First Stone

CF; and the narrative act by the CN. This formula illustrates how the utterance is communicated in the narrative: (‘I’ narrates: (diegetic ‘I’ focalizes:)) A’s speech act. Unlike the actors’ voices in the interview in chapter one, this speech act has not been transcribed and therefore requires a technical device to bring out the friend’s voice. The utterance itself is a perception of Garner’s memory, and the narrator—as the speaking agent—is required to mediate the friend’s voice, and on this occasion, does so in reflector mode. Two of the three agents in this sentence—the narrator and focalizor—have the same name and identity (‘I’) but are operating on different diegetic levels. Since Garner’s experiencing self is now the point from which the elements are viewed, her narrating self fades into the background and becomes ‘non-perceptible’ (np). The formula for a ‘participant’ CN is: N(np) → (CF (p)) → A.

The narrating self and experiencing self work in tandem. When acting as a ‘witness’, the CN aligns closely with the experiencing self so that it can offer a vision of its memory, which often makes it difficult to differentiate between the two. When the CN is a ‘participant’, the narrator functions as a transparent, technical means of communication so as to remain hidden and allow the reader unimpeded access to the experiencing self’s consciousness—what Bal refers to as ‘internal focalization’474. A CN cannot be a ‘witness’ and a ‘participant’ at the same time. An I-narrative is either in teller mode and a ‘witness’ to events or it is in reflector mode and a ‘participant’ in the story. The point from which the elements are viewed cannot simultaneously be intradiegetic and extradiegetic—it is one or the other.

Every time the subject of focalization switches, a temporal and perceptual deictic shift takes place.475 Peter Stockwell explains that ‘a speaking, writing or
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thinking ‘voice’ represents a deictic centre, which a reader can mentally project by adopting the cognitive stance that best accounts for the sense of coherence across a text.\textsuperscript{476} Patterns of ‘deictic anchoring’ set the dimensions of particular deictic fields—perceptual, spatial, temporal, textual, and so on—such that when the speaking, writing or thinking ‘voice’ changes, the reader experiences a ‘deictic shift’.\textsuperscript{477} A perceptual deictic shift ‘refers to the movements between perceptual viewpoints, usually introduced and maintained with personal pronouns, noun phrases, perception and mental predicates.’\textsuperscript{478} An illustration of a perceptual deictic shift is seen in the ‘dramatic discursive shift’ between the first and second chapters in which the impersonal ‘voice’ in chapter one transforms into an overtly subjective ‘voice’ that the reader recognises as Garner’s writing voice in chapter two. Temporal shifts are ‘marked by locative expressions, as well as tense and aspect shift…’.\textsuperscript{479} The discourse deixis in chapter one is indicative of locative expressions while the narrator’s use of the preterite in the second chapter illustrates tense and aspect shift.

Stockwell argues that ‘the movements into and out of different deictic fields are seen as pushes in and pops out from one deictic centre to another.’\textsuperscript{480} Although the deictic shift from Garner’s narrating self to her experiencing self at the start of chapter two is almost instantaneous, the most extensive and palpable use of this deictic pattern can be found in chapter sixteen, in which Garner attempts to envisage what actually happened the night of the alleged incidents:

What sort of a night was it, Wednesday 16 October 1991? That depends, of course, on who is remembering.
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It was spring. Exams were coming. It was a splendid occasion, a triumphant night, a very successful function. During a speech at dinner people were screaming through the vents. It was just another college evening. Nothing to distinguish it from any other Smoko. From memory it was a warmish night. A nice night to stay around after dinner and have a few drinks. But some people thought, no, and went home. A woman visiting from another college said to the Master let’s go and see what the kids are doing. It was a strange night. There was definitely something in the air. A loss of authority. A lot of the tutors were drunk, dancing with each other, pinching people’s bums. Let’s go see what the kids are doing. One of the senior tutors was blotto. She took an earring out of her ear – it was a pink, reasonably large ball – and gave it to a boy. There was a sense of abandon. One woman took her top off. There wasn’t a good feel about the night. People who hate Smokos were not in euphoria. People were very drunk so don’t count on subtleties but they heard stories. The room was dark; the only light came in from the quadrangle. It was a great party but not a wild party. See what the kids are doing. They asked him to dance. Maybe there was an element of teasing. Perhaps at first it was almost a kind of game. At least one person was dazed and confused. It was a warmish night. Something in the air. Let’s go see what the kids are doing.

But the Bureau of meteorology recorded that on Wednesday 16 1991 in Melbourne there were showers and rain. The top temperature was 14.6°, winds were moderate from the south-west; it was fine in the evening.’ Of this at least we can be certain. (119-20)

The emphasis on the ‘was’ in the rhetorical question: ‘What sort of night was it, Wednesday 16 October 1991?’ makes it clear that the narrator is the point from which the events are viewed. The change in tense and parataxis in the next sentence (‘That depends, of course, on who is remembering…’) suggests that a collection of different memories of the evening is about to be recounted in the narrative. When this does occur, the narrator becomes transparent-independent and italicises particular words or phrases in each sentence, signalling that these are actually direct quotes from unnamed sources. It is clear that certain sentences contain quotes from unnamed sources, for instance: ‘It was a splendid occasion, a triumphant night, a very successful function.’ In this cumulative sentence, the determiner ‘a’ is initially italicised in the main clause but not in the two following adjective clauses: ‘…a triumphant, a very successful function…’, thus demarcating each clause as containing an independent quote rather than three clauses with one quote from a single source.

The switch in focalization from the narrating self in paragraph one to the host of unnamed sources in the proceeding paragraph causes a temporal and perceptual
deictic shift. The temporal shift is created by the transition from the present continuous tense at the end of paragraph one (‘That depends, of course, on who is remembering [my italics]…’) to the simple past tense at the start of chapter two (‘It was spring…’). As the narrative moves across these temporal deixes, the reader becomes aware of a perceptual deictic shift taking place, with the subject of focalization changing from the narrator’s viewpoint (in teller mode) to that of the unnamed sources (in reflector mode) as they each recall their impressions of the evening. As each voice pushes out the other, it becomes evident that the voices are not merely juxtaposed but are dialectically related to one another: cooperating, clashing, and competing.\footnote{Sukanya Dasgupta, “Apollo’s Prophets: Michael Drayton’s Creation of Poetic Personae,” in \textit{Literary Spectrums: Recent Studies in English Literature}, ed. Partha Kumar Mukhopadhyay (New Delhi: Saup & Sons, 2007), 108.} The three voices in the cumulative sentence above are harmonious in their depiction of the evening. However, when the narrator states that there was ‘Nothing to distinguish it from any other Smoko…’ but goes on to say: ‘There was definitely something in the air…’, a clear dissonance emerges. Bakhtin addresses this type of dialectic tension in his concept of heteroglossia: ‘Every utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear.’ (272). The voices in the passage above exert the same kind of opposing pressures in the narrative. When the voices are in harmony they ratify each other, exerting a centrifugal force on this pastiche of testimonies. However, when they clash and compete, they threaten to destabilise the entire account by creating a cacophony of sounds as each speaking agent clambers and vies for control over the deictic centre of the piece.

This centrifugal force is further countered by the thematic structure of this depiction of the night. The narrator intones: ‘Let’s go see what the kids are doing…’
three times, transforming this seemingly nonchalant proposal by the female visitor into an elegy that is seeped in dramatic irony because it suggests that the entire tragedy stemmed from a moment of thoughtless spontaneity; an impulsive decision that could have easily been avoided. Yet, this anaphora also highlights the underlying purpose of the scene. James L. Mey refers to this ‘multivocality’ as ‘the active management of voicing in the text…’; through this type of voicing, Dr Shepherd’s progression towards the party on that fateful evening can be charted. The morass of opinions, viewpoints and recollections are Garner’s only means of documenting the event and she arranges them in such a way that, although Dr Shepherd’s actual movements have to be imagined, his journey from the dinner to the party becomes the focal point of this entire scene, despite the constant noise and distraction of the voices and activities at the party. The narrator announces Shepherd’s arrival by saying: ‘See what the kids are doing’. The ellipsis of the word ‘Let’s’ changes what was a proposal into a statement, shifting the deictic centre from the unnamed sources’ point of view to Dr Shepherd’s as he is asked to observe the reckless activities of his students and staff at the party, proving that he is now in their presence and moments away from making a serious error in judgement.

Garner ends the scene by stating: ‘But the Bureau of Meteorology recorded that…’, reporting the weather conditions and temperature on that particular evening. Her use of the conjunction ‘But’ places this report in opposition to her prior account using the multitude of unnamed sources; in doing so, she discredits every recollection. Garner’s sense of doubt about the truth ever being known, as evident in this scene, is palpable by the end of the book. One of the benefits of Garner’s overtly subjective
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style is that it allows her to acknowledge this ultimate failure without devaluing all that has preceded it. Although she initially believes that she is on the verge of a discovery that would cause an upheaval in her ‘whole belief-structure, particularly where men and women were concerned, and the way power shifts between…’ (72), her efforts are constantly frustrated by the complainants’ reticence and the recalcitrance of their ‘chief supporter’483 (a staff member at the college). Garner begins to doubt her ability to ‘maintain what used to be called an “open mind”…’ (178) and finally loses hope altogether, conceding that she will never know, at least with any degree of certainty, what really happened between Shepherd and the two complainants that night (221).

By refusing to provide an unequivocal account, Garner is able to draw out the nuances, contradictions, and inconsistencies that permeate this story. She does this rather than explaining or omitting altogether the irreconcilable aspects in her version of events. Essentially, Garner’s exploration of the ambiguity surrounding this crime results in a book that is a ‘map of ambivalence’484; an open and subjective account of the reporting process and her efforts to find out what happened. Consequently, by the end, the focus of the narrative is less about the actual or perceived crime, and more about the institutional and human responses to it and the lessons that could be drawn from it. Garner later acknowledged that her attempts to understand the events remained ultimately unfulfilled; yet, despite her version of the events being full of holes, she nonetheless hoped that ‘that these holes might, after all, have a use; that through them might pass air and light; that they might even provide a path for the
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passage of eros; and that they might leave, for women and men who want to think generously about these things, room to move.\textsuperscript{485}

Out of the three MLJ texts analysed in this thesis, \textit{The First Stone} sits at the furthest point from the romantic ideal of literary journalism on Webb’s continuum because Garner is the least effective of the three writers in considering the ‘ethical dilemmas implicit in creating worlds for anonymous readers.’\textsuperscript{486} In \textit{The Journalist and the Murderer}, Janet Malcolm claimed that journalists should feel some ‘compunction about the exploitive character of the journalist-subject relationship…’\textsuperscript{487} Although Garner is careful, deliberate, and tries to keep an open mind when investigating the story, she only goes as far as questioning the veracity of her sources—she never considers the moral justification of her actions as journalist. This restricts her from exploring the reality that actors and spectators create in their interaction or from taking responsibility for her role as an observer, which in MLJ, is considered to be grounded in an epistemology and an ethics.\textsuperscript{488}

\footnotesize
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The Whore of Akron

The title of Scott Raab’s first book, *The Whore of Akron*, derogatorily refers to LeBron James, one of the greatest basketball players of the modern era. James was born and raised in the satellite city of Akron, just south of Cleveland, Ohio, which is home to The Cleveland Cavaliers, a basketball team responsible for igniting James’ illustrious NBA career and zealously supported by Raab. Cleveland has not won a national title in any major sporting code since 27 December 1964, ‘when the Cleveland Browns beat the Baltimore Colts and won the NFL World Championship.’ Raab was at the Cleveland Municipal Stadium that day and witnessed the Browns become world champions but has been waiting nearly five decades to experience another day like it. It is this lack of sporting success, compounded by a crippling recession and declining population, that helps explain why not only Cavaliers fans but the entire city pinned their hopes on a prodigious local talent like LeBron James. Expectations were high that he was capable of returning their city to its halcyon days and becoming ‘the Moses every Cleveland fan felt he’d be.’ (6-7).

At the start of his book, Raab displays an almost adolescent infatuation with James and his sporting prowess. On one occasion, Raab describes being in the players’ locker room and marvelling at James, who had just stepped out of the shower. Raab writes that, even in a league replete with aesthetically pleasing physiques, James’s body was a ‘masterpiece’: ‘Hewn of sinew, apparently impervious as iron—muscled yet sleek, thick-shouldered yet loose of limb, James looks different from every other player in the league, especially in a damp towel.’ (5). On another

occasion, Raab says that, as he sat in his hotel room watching James play against the Detroit Pistons on television, he became so overwhelmed that he wept because he believed he was witnessing ‘the single most astonishing performance by any Cleveland athlete…’ (6).

Yet, despite James’ exceptional sporting talent and the unquestioning support that he received from his club and city, the ‘Cavs’ failed to win the NBA title in the seven years James wore the wine and gold shirt. This run of losses culminated in May 2010 in an abject and spiritless playoff defeat against the Boston Celtics, after which James became a free-agent. Almost every major NBA team in the league subsequently courted him but, according to Raab, ‘no other franchise or city grovelled like poor Cleveland and the Cavaliers; none had so much to lose.’ (119). Raab describes how Cleveland fans erected signs on the major bypasses that lay between James’ training pitches and his home, desperately trying to persuade him to stay; the Cleveland Orchestra played a special musical tribute to James in the heart of the city, with the word ‘HOME’ spelt out in lights on one of the buildings; and the billionaire owner of the Cavs, Dan Gilbert, commissioned a video costing half a million dollars that was ‘filled with plain folks—black and white, old and young—just talking about what James meant to them and to Cleveland.’ (200). All of these efforts were to no avail, however, and on 8 July 2010, James announced, in a special televised event on ESPN entitled ‘The Decision’, his intention to defect to the Miami Heat. According to Raab, during the course of this sixty-minute program ‘King James’, ‘The Chosen One’, revealed himself to be ‘The Whore of Akron’ (9).

case against the man he calls “every inch a prima donna” and “a player who cared nothing for the fans and the town,” it’s too one-dimensional to be convincing…[which]…raises the question of whether he chose to focus on James to enlighten, to grieve or to attract the millions of LeBron-bashers who might be shopping for books.” 490 Nathaniel Friedman, writing in the Wall Street Journal, is equally critical, describing Raab’s ire towards James in the book as ‘grotesque, one-dimensional and tedious.’ 491 And blogger James Yates reported that it is rare for him to be presented with a book so worthy of criticism, writing that it angered him because ‘Raab displays the occasional flash of talented analysis, but wilfully chooses to come across like any bile-spewing sports fan…” 492

Jason Gay of the Wall Street Journal took a more sympathetic approach, conceding that ‘what comes out of Raab is not a measured essay, but a howling rage…’ and that Raab ‘is indelicate and unhinged….’ Gay also contends, however, that ‘the book soars because Raab is unflinchingly honest, naked with emotions and embarrassments most of us keep penned inside.’ 493 Like Gay, other critics who responded positively to the text believe Raab’s candidness about his own faults and failures compensates for his attacks on James. For instance, Associated Press reporter Rob Merrill states that ‘the book easily could have spiralled into something unseemly…But Raab manages to engage readers by weaving in his personal story…We’re treated to flashbacks of Raab’s alcoholic and drug-addicted past, all

told with unflinching honesty and a sense of humor.”494 Echoing this sentiment, Ben Reiter of *Sports Illustrated* declared that ‘while Raab’s sustained attack on James (“no guts, no heart, no soul”) is diverting, it is the author’s self-portrait of a man and a fan of serious extremes, one who loves his wife and son as fiercely as he hates most of the rest of the world, that engrosses.’495

In *New York Magazine*, Will Blythe argued that there are striking parallels between Raab and James which, notwithstanding the legitimacy of Raab’s grievances, may have intensified the writer’s animosity towards his nemesis. As he explains:

> At the heart of Raab’s anger, and at the center of his bitter lament, is actually a strange affinity between James and his scourge. Both grew up with absent fathers and difficult mothers. Both enjoy talents that have taken them far from Cleveland. But James has refused so far to shoulder responsibility for his failures on the court in a way that Raab, a former addict, has done in life…496

Despite the obvious differences in age and ethnicity, Raab is aware that certain aspects of his life and upbringing are similar to James’—an insight that occasionally allows him to show flickers of empathy and understanding towards the basketballer. Raab is also mindful that what he says about James will determine how his audience will view his own character, based on the belief that ‘What another sees in you will reveal that person. What you see in another reveals your self. We are—each of us and all of us—mirrors.’ (174).

This notion of mirrors is crucial to understanding the book because Raab uses it to justify his attack on James. In the text, Raab’s narratorial persona constructs a dialogical relationship with James, using his hatred of, and anger toward, the
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basketball star to explore his own mentality as an ardent and embittered sports fan. Although Raab is too extreme in his views to be regarded as a typical sports fan, readers who are passionate sports fans will at least understand the anguish caused by James’ departure. Raab claims that if he holds a mirror up to James, he will be able to better understand himself and the root of his suffering. In turn, this dialectical process of introspection will encourage his readers to reflect on their own responses and attitudes towards sports.

There have been many clinical studies of the psychology of sports fans. One such study was based on a highly contested game of American football between Dartmouth and Princeton Universities in 1951. Conducted by Albert Hastorf (a psychologist at Dartmouth) and Hadley Cantril (a sociologist at Princeton), its aim was to try to determine why students from the two universities could watch the same game yet draw such radically opposing views of what happened. According to Farhad Manjoo, this study revealed that ‘What each of us notices is a function of a personalized calculus—an idiosyncratic, unconscious filter, built over a lifetime, that we apply to all that we take in.’ Each set of fans, therefore, was predisposed by an unconscious filter to being sympathetic to its own players and intolerant of the opposition. This phenomenon Manjoo calls ‘selective perception’, which involves individuals choosing sources of information according to their own pre-existing biases. Selective perception is particularly acute in highly identified sports fans due to the heightened emotional investment in their respective teams. According to Daniel L. Wann, this can cause negative psychological consequences when an individual

identifies with a team that is performing poorly or suffering from adversity. Essentially, *The Whore of Akron* is Raab’s account of the negative psychological consequences of James’ perceived betrayal and how these manifested in his life. It is an accurate reflection of what he and many other Clevelanders thought and felt at the time.

This process of self-reflection is not the only reason that Raab believes he has a right to attack James. When asked in an interview in 2011 whether it was now appropriate for him to forgive and forget James’ betrayal due to the length of time that has passed since The Decision, Raab replied:

I think that’s valid, but I don’t know that for a certain kind of fan that’s as easy to do as it is to say. One of the things that defines a fan for me is not letting go anymore than Browns fans have let go of The Drive and are happy for John Elway that he finally won Super Bowl rings, and are pleased with The Move and happy that fine Brooklyn boy (Art Modell) got to win a Super Bowl.

It is clear from these comments that Raab considers it his duty as a diehard fan to remember the harm caused by those who are seen to have not acted in the team’s best interests. Therefore, in writing the book, Raab wants the damage James caused to be fully documented and never forgotten.

*The Whore of Akron* is an unusual piece of journalism because Raab’s function as a reporter is secondary to his primary aim, which is to examine what makes him, as a sports fan, ‘so passionate but such a hater…’ According to Bill Livingston, the idea that a reporter can grow up, live and work in a city yet still

---


approach sporting contests with strict objectivity, as an impartial observer, is a ‘flimsy construct’\textsuperscript{502}. Livingston suggests that Raab has ‘showed how thin is the membrane of objectivity in which reporters try to wrap our fan impulses...’\textsuperscript{503} by capturing an attitude that is shared but concealed by many sports reporters because they are professionally obligated to comply with the conventions of journalistic objectivity.

In the text, Raab presents the narrative from his point of view as a fan and then subjects his observations to interpretative analysis—a typical MLJ approach, in which observing is not only a means to understand the world but is itself an object of analysis.\textsuperscript{504} This approach enables Raab to consider the ethical dilemmas implicit in creating worlds for anonymous readers.\textsuperscript{505} As revealed in the previous chapter of this thesis, Helen Garner did not sufficiently explore the reality that actor and spectator create in their interaction and was therefore unable to take full responsibility for her role as an observer in \textit{The First Stone}. Raab is able to take more responsibility for his role as observer due to his decision not to approach the story as a reporter, which would have restricted his capacity to express himself freely. In contrast, Garner is openly committed to her role as a reporter in \textit{The First Stone}, pursuing the two female students at the centre of the Ormond College scandal with the unquestioning belief that the public’s right to know—which Anita L. Allen says is a ‘powerful and broad ideal that greatly influences journalistic practice...’\textsuperscript{506}—overrides their right to personal privacy. This is not to suggest that Garner does not empathise with the two complainants, merely that she struggles to appreciate why they will not agree to be

\textsuperscript{503} Livingston, “Scott Raab’s ‘Whore of Akron’ probes darkest regions of fandom.”
\textsuperscript{504} Eason, “The New Journalism and the Image-World,” 57.
\textsuperscript{505} Ibid.
CHAPTER 9: *The Whore of Akron*

interviewed by her, and at one point pleads: ‘If you have a case, why won’t you put it to me?’

507 For this reason, *The Whore of Akron* is positioned closer than Garner’s text to the romantic ideal of literary journalism on Webb’s continuum.

*The Whore of Akron* and *The First Stone* are similar, however, in that Garner and Raab were both refused access by crucial subjects yet decided to pursue the story anyway. Raab is more accepting of this impediment than Garner, and is able to respond pragmatically for two reasons. Firstly, he respects what he calls ‘the First Law’ of sports journalism, which is: ‘Everything that happens is good for a story.’

(174). Accordingly, every time an individual or organisation with vested interests in James tries to obstruct his access or scupper his plans for the book, Raab simply documents this with a view to exposing the complicity in this hidden and tightly managed world. The second reason why Raab is reconciled to his lack of access to James is due to the emotional impact that ‘The Decision’ had on him. Raab explains that the decision transformed the way he viewed the media and professional basketball in general. Initially, he had resigned himself to the fact that he would never see Cleveland win another championship in his lifetime and would die ‘a froth mouthed fan’ (121). Later on, however, he describes having had an epiphany, realising that he could atone for the pain and suffering that James had caused Cleveland by putting his journalistic ‘talents’ (121) to use. From this point onwards, Raab’s sole mission was ‘to trail James—the Whore of Akron—to Miami and bear witness to both James’ season there and to the inexhaustible misery of Cleveland fans.’

508 This type of motivating factor is completely different to the ‘businesslike

curiosity’ that prompted Garner to investigate the Ormond College scandal. Raab accuses sports journalists of not understanding fans’ rage or grasping ‘the larger cultural and historical issues at the heart of the matter...’ (155), which dented his faith in the profession. Raab believes that functioning as a conventional journalist would have merely perpetuated this failure and required him to submit to James’ public relations team, a prospect he was unwilling to consider. In choosing to approach the story as an enraged fan, Raab is not only attacking James in a bid to understand himself but is also exposing the media’s shortcomings.

Raab’s attitude to the media echoes claims made in the U.S. in the ’60s and ’70s that ‘A who, what, where, when, why style of reporting could not begin to capture the anger of a black power movement or the euphoria of a Woodstock....’ This shortcoming paved the way for New Journalism to emerge as an alternative mode of news writing. As Nicolaus Mills explains, the New Journalists believed that it was necessary to get as close to their subjects and subject matter as possible and ‘report events from the inside out...’. Raab’s reportorial methods are consistent with this approach; for example, he uses his press credentials to gain access to special media functions and conferences in order to get as close as possible to James, all the while reporting what he sees and experiences during these events. In doing so, Raab is able to provide the reader with privileged access and an insight into what is going on behind the scenes, enabling him to reveal the disjunction between reported and experienced reality, which is typical of the MLJ approach.

---
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Had Raab decided to write a RLJ account of James’ defection to the Miami Heat, he probably would have constructed a well-ordered social drama with a transparent-independent narrative voice. However, RLJ’s requisite aesthetic distance would have made it impossible for him to chronicle ‘the interaction between consciousness and events…’\(^\text{\textsuperscript{513}}\), a typical MLJ feature which allowed Raab to conduct ‘a riotous, no-holds-barred one-man case study in the pathology of obsessive fandom…’\(^\text{\textsuperscript{514}}\) and the freedom to present the narrative from a personal, idiosyncratic perspective. However, this involves the use of an identifiable-dependant narrative voice and requires Raab to be the protagonist in his own story. The result is a disrupted spectacle in which the roles of actor and spectator are not clearly defined,\(^\text{\textsuperscript{515}}\) as the following passage reveals:

Everyone’s here to see LeBron. Especially me. I’ve shaved my Santa Clause beard—Lisa missed my dimples, which apparently are more pleasant to behold than the adipose cascade of the rest of me—and I have no idea whether James has any idea who I am, regardless of how many times we saw each other last season in Cleveland and at Cavs’ road games. I sit in the front row, make sure my Chief Wahoo tattoo is in his line of sight, and stare at him. His eyes dart each time ours meet. Scowling, he strokes his beard.

I haven’t been this close to him since I was in the Cavs’ locker room, since I told him he was the best basketball player I’d ever seen and I’m undone by my rage. Seeing him up there in his Heat uniform, I know that in a world of pure will and no consequences, I’d pay to have him knee-capped, with no sense of guilt at all. And at the same time, I know that this says far more about me than it does about LeBron James…

I heard your game last May, LeBron. It said, No mas. You choked, you quit, you ran. I really ought to grab one of these folding chairs and smash your skull.

Not good, I know. Homicidal ideation rarely is a sign of quality sobriety. I’m a dad, a husband, a pillar of society. I’m in an uproar like this in a room of sportswriters over a ball player, the player can’t possibly be the real problem. (131-2)

In this passage, Raab is reporting from James’ first media conference as a Miami Heat player and using his method of posing as a journalist but recording the events from a fan’s perspective. The narrator explains that ‘Everyone’s here to see LeBron…’ and

\(^\text{\textsuperscript{513}}\) Ibid., 60.
then shifts the focus of the narrative onto Raab’s experiencing self (‘Especially me…’), revealing that he has shaved his ‘Santa Clause beard’ because his wife, Lisa, missed his dimples. The explanation of why he shaved his beard is contained within em dashes, indicating that it is separate to the main discourse. As noted in the previous chapter, there is a temporal gap between the experiencing-I and the narrating-I because the narrator’s comments are on an extradiegetic level whereas the actors’ perceptions occur within the diegesis.\(^{516}\) It is clear in this instance that Raab’s narrating self has taken over the focalizing position from his experiencing self as he is explaining (to the reader) why he (the experiencing-I) has shaved his beard, indicating that the experiencing-I is an object to be focalized (in the past, ‘back then’). Moreover, the absence of speech marks indicates that these comments are not spoken out aloud (at the media conference) but are meant solely for the reader, who is the intended addressee. This discursive act by the narrating-I is comparable to the theatrical convention of an ‘aside’\(^{517}\) because the narrator is communicating with the reader as events develop in order to provide information that may be needed to understand what is going on.

The first person perspective (1\(^{st}\) PP) in this passage and the present tense are combined to create a phenomenon that Dorrit Cohn calls ‘simultaneous narration’\(^{518}\), which occurs when a first person narrator reports events ‘as if they are currently taking place (in the present tense).’\(^{519}\) William Frawley and David Herman explain that, with this type of narration, the present tense ‘codes past time events since the

---

\(^{516}\) Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 145.


events recounted have already happened, yet are being reasserted in the present.'\textsuperscript{520} Raab is reasserting events that have already happened in the present to make it appear that he is reporting during the here-and-now of the media conference. However, as Monika Fludernik explains, a story has to have happened in the past in order to be tellable,\textsuperscript{521} which means that the narrator’s perspective is manifestly retrospective and must be concealed so as not to interfere with the immediacy of the simultaneous narration.

According to Dan Shen, the co-existence of the retrospective and experiencing perspective in the first-person mode ‘not only gives the narrator the possibility of varying the angle or distance of vision, but also enables the narrator to play on the two available modes of focalization.’\textsuperscript{522} The assimilation of an aside during what appears to be the here-and-now of the event being narrated illustrates one of the ways in which a narrator can ‘play’ on these two modes of focalization in first person narrative. Raab has subtly combined these two perspectives using the same temporal grammar so that he can present the narrative as if he were reporting in situ as the events unfold and yet still allow the reader to benefit from his ulterior knowledge by providing extraneous pieces of information.

After the aside, the narrative is again focalized from the experiencing-I’s point of view, with the narrator saying: ‘…and I have no idea whether James has any idea who I am…’. In its most basic sense, this part of the third sentence states that the experiencing-I is contemplating whether James recognises him now that he has shaved his beard. The first clause (‘…and I have no idea…’) is an independent clause

\textsuperscript{520} William Frawley and David Herman, “Narrative Semantics,” in Herman Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory, 362.
\textsuperscript{521} Monica Fludernik, Towards a ‘Natural’ Narratology (London: Routledge, 1996), 223.
that is linked by the coordinating conjunction ‘and’ to the very first clause of the sentence (‘I’ve shaved my Santa Clause beard…’), which is also an independent clause. The subordinating conjunction ‘whether’ at the start of the next clause (‘…whether James has any idea…’) indicates that it is a subordinate clause. Finally, the third and final clause in this part of the sentence is a relative clause (‘…who I am…’), which serves as the object of the matrix clause (‘…and I have no idea…’) at the beginning of this section of the sentence.

These three clauses (matrix/subordinate/relative) function as follows: I (subject/narrator) have no idea / whether James (indirect object) has any idea / who I am (direct object/narrator). As this shows, the matrix clause (the first clause) is both syntactically and semantically dependent on the subordinate clause (the second clause) because without it the narrator would be saying: ‘…and I have no idea / who I am…’. The subordinate clause clarifies that the narrator is considering the object of the matrix clause (‘…who I am…’) from James’ perspective, as he wonders whether James recognises him without a beard. However, even though James is referred to and his point of view is considered, he is not the focal point of the narrative. As the breakdown of the three clauses indicates, the experiencing-I is both the subject (that narrates) and the object (that is focused on), and is therefore the focalizer and the focal point of the narrative at the same time.

This use of the narrator as an entity that embodies simultaneously both the subject and object positions in the sentence becomes more pronounced in the next sentence, when the narrator says: ‘I sit in the front row, make sure my Chief Wahoo tattoo is in his line of sight, and stare at him.’ The narration in this sentence is an objective registration of the ongoing events with an exterior view on the narrator
As Per Krogh Hansen explains, ‘To propose a causal-temporal relation between events, the events have to be diachronically related (and not synchronically) and the relating instance (the narrator) has to be in a position from which the account becomes narratable—that is from a distance.’ This suggests that, although it is possible to reassert past events in the present using simultaneous narration, it is difficult, if not impossible, to erase the temporal distance between the narrator and narrated events. This is illustrated in the sentence above where the experiencing-I is forced to give an exterior view of itself despite being the narrating subject and focalizor of the narrative.

Of course, it could be argued that this entire passage is focalized by the narrating-I, which would explain why the experiencing-I is objectified and presented from an exterior view of itself. However, once Raab has fantasised about having James knee-capped and smashing his skull in with a folding chair, the narrator says: ‘I’m in an uproar like this in a room of sportswriters over a ball player…’. In these comments, the narrator is clearly stating that Raab’s violent thoughts occurred in the media room at the time—not afterwards, ruling out any possibility of the narrating-I being the focalizor and experiencing these fantasies in retrospect, after the fact.

According to Hansen, the basic configuration of simultaneous narration—1st PP in the present tense—manifests a resistance towards narrative in general because it obscures the temporal distance between the incidents being narrated and the narrative situation (the act of narration). The objectified experiencing-I in the passage above shows that in simultaneous narration there is a tension between the actual narration
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525 Ibid., 335.
and the narrator’s (prior) psychological motivation and embodiment as an actor. Raab implements this type of narration because it offers him a way of presenting the narrative from an experiencing perspective, which can then be treated as an ‘object of analysis’ that allows him to explore his own motivations as a Cavs fan. However, in the process, he has created a disrupted spectacle in which the roles of actor and spectator are no longer clearly defined. The simultaneous narration creates the impression that Raab is an actor at the media conference but very little attention is being paid to what is actually happening there. Indeed, all that is physically occurring is that Raab is staring at James and trying to antagonise him with his Chief Wahoo tattoo, which causes James to scowl and stroke his beard. However, this lived experience rapidly degenerates into imagined experience, with most of the passage concentrating on Raab’s psychological turmoil as his mind slips into homicidal ideation. This interferes with Raab’s role as spectator, as the story becomes less about what is occurring at the conference and more about his internal psychological reality.

This self-reflexivity in The Whore of Akron becomes so extreme towards the end of the book that it is increasingly unclear whether what is depicted is a product of Raab’s imagination or an actual event that has occurred ‘out there’ in reality, as the following passage illustrates:

> It takes no more time to rethink the plan than it does to pour a glass of water in the kitchen and bolt the Valium and the Vicodin. The chatter inside the refrigerator has stopped. The dog looks at me. Smartest dog I’ve ever known. Fucker is smiling...
> I sit in the rocker, open the laptop, and sign on to Twitter.
> First thing I see is a tweet from @KingJames:
> “I love my chef B so much! He made the meanest/best peach cobbler I’ve ever had in my life. Wow!!”

---
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James attaches a photo of the cobbler, which looks fabulous: two huge rough-cut hunks, gold-crusted and gleaming, with a couple of slabs of vanilla ice cream on top…

The room spins and goes dark, but only for a second. When I lift my head off my chest, I see James’s tweet, each letter of it throbbing…
LeBron is sitting on the couch and has a dish of cobbler for me.

“Is that what you’re going to teach your boy?” LeBron asks. “You’re killing yourself with a fork and spoon.”

Jesus, this cobbler’s beastly good.

“Haaaaa.”

He’s dressed like Urkel. I saw you in this outfit—a cardigan over a plaid shirt, big black-framed glasses—at Madison Square Garden, a year ago almost to the day…

“How dare you judge me?”

You spit on millions of people.

“I don’t answer to them. I do what’s right for LeBron.”

Is that what you’d tell a West Akron kid who cried when you left the Cavs?

“I spit on nobody. I played my ass off for seven years. Those kids never once heard of me with drugs or guns or any of that stuff. Not once. Those were the best years that team ever had, and you judge me for leaving like it’s the worst crime ever committed.”

I can’t think of a parallel betrayal in the history of American sports.

“What’s the worst thing you ever did?”

Summer of 1994. I got the woman I love pregnant. She was afraid to have the kid. I wanted the kid—I was forty-two years old, I’d destroyed everything in my life, including my marriage. I still wanted the kid. All she wanted in return was the promise that I’d sober up. Just the promise.

“What happened?”

She had the abortion. I drove her to the hospital myself. Drove her there, drove her home, went back to my place, got fucked up, got out my shotgun, and put it in my mouth.

“What happened?”

I couldn’t do that, either.

“You crying?”

It’s the cobbler, LeBron. It’s the meanest/best cobbler I’ve ever had. (194-200)

This passage depicts Raab ingesting Valium and Vicodin tablets in his kitchen, which leads to a prolonged fantasy. Over the course of this episode, he has conversations with his dog, his deceased father and LeBron James. Before the drugs take full effect, Raab sees James’ Twitter post and accompanying picture of a cobbler sandwich that he is yearning for. In the fantasy that ensues, James offers Raab a dish of cobbler before chastising him for eating it, suggesting that Raab is setting a bad example for his son. This reference to Raab’s son suggests that James has prior knowledge of his family and indicates that Raab is imagining that they are familiar with each other.
After a brief discussion (that is omitted from the passage above), James proceeds to quiz Raab about why he is judging him and defends himself against Raab’s claim that he has shown contempt for millions of people in one of the worst betrayals in American sports history. James then turns the focus back onto Raab and asks him a series of questions about the worst thing he has ever done, which Raab answers without restraint.

As David Eason explains, MLJ is a mode that characteristically blurs traditional distinctions between fantasy and reality, which this passage perfectly illustrates. Although it is clear to the reader that Raab is fantasising, the distinction is not always clear. Of the numerous literary journalists who have depicted their own fantasies, possibly the most famous is Hunter S. Thompson about whom John Hellmann writes: ‘As the shaping authorial mind behind the narrating persona, Thompson creates a self-caricature who is extremely disorientated, both by actual events and by paranoid illusions—often induced by liquor or drugs—present in his own consciousness.’ This description of Thompson’s work could also be applied to Raab’s approach in the passage above. Like Thompson, Raab is right in the centre of the action as the shaping mind behind the narratorial persona, which is experiencing a mental breakdown that leads to the blurring of fantasy and reality. However, as Jerome Klinkowitz explains, ‘the breakdown itself carries much of the “information” about the country of the writer’s own imagination which he is…reporting.’ Raab is a self-confessed obese man and former drug addict constantly struggling to contain his weight and remain sober, ever fearful of the spectre of ill health and possibly even death. Although ingesting Valium and Vicodin represents a seemingly catastrophic
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turn of events in his life, Raab parodies this breakdown using the peach cobbler as a metaphor for the relapse. At the start of the passage, the narrator describes the cobbler as ‘gold crusted and gleaming’, clearly expressing his longing for it. When Raab recovers from the initial impact of the drugs, he notices the letters of James’ sandwich tweet ‘throbbing’ and then looks over to see James sitting on the couch holding a dish of cobbler for him, which he quickly eats, describing it as ‘beastly good.’ By connecting the ‘throbbing’ letters of the tweet with his fantasy of eating the dish of cobbler, Raab is chronicling the interaction between consciousness and events. 533 Therefore, this portrayal of his devouring of the peach cobbler not only conveys information about Raab’s own imagination but reveals that temptation is an ever-present physical and psychological struggle.

This scene also parodies James, who is dressed like ‘Urkel’—a reference to the goofy character Steve Urkel in the popular US television show Family Matters, which aired between 1989 and 1997—as well as Raab, who is the embodiment of ‘Jumbo’, his alter-ego that was ‘on the loose, riding high…’ (172) while travelling to Miami to watch James play against the Orlando Magic basketball team. John Hellmann explains that parody has useful journalistic applications: it enables writers to present black humourist visions of actual events without violating the actuality of these events and allows them to reveal aspects of events not readily apparent to those with normal perception. 534 Raab uses this technique in the passage as a way of giving James an opportunity—albeit an imagined one—to respond to the criticisms and judgements made against him during the course of the book. Ironically, though, James’ apparition turns the focus onto Raab, causing a role reversal, with James

534 Hellmann, Fables of Fact, 69.
becoming Urkel the interrogator who forces Jumbo to contend with his own life mistakes.

The parody in this scene exemplifies how MLJ focuses on observation as a form of lived experience grounded in an epistemology and an ethics. Raab is taking responsibility for his acts of observation by exploring the deep, hidden recesses of his own psyche, exposing his fears, insecurities and regrets about actions he has taken in the past that continue to haunt him. This enables the reader to better appreciate the human lens through which the events are reported and raises the reader’s awareness of how the actors and events are depicted and why. Observation, for both narrator and reader, becomes an object of analysis, and not merely a means to understand the world. Raab’s descriptions of his violent fantasies and hallucinations, and his use of parody, are self-reflexive techniques that render this text intimately subjective, whereby it is nearly impossible to separate the writer’s sense of self from the events being depicted, consistent with the journalistic ideal of romanticism.

---

536 Ibid.
Riding Toward Everywhere

In January 2007, Harper’s Magazine published William T. Vollmann’s feature article, ‘Catching Out: Travels in an open boxcar’, which he later expanded and included (with minor alterations) as the opening chapter of Riding Toward Everywhere—a book-length account of his ‘adventures hopping freight trains and trying out the hobo lifestyle…’\(^{537}\). In March 2008, Vollmann said in a radio interview with Michael Silverblatt that as he gets older he wants to feel that he has really lived his life, which involves: ‘seeing more stars in the night sky; seeing more physical reality; making sure I understand the limits of what is in my head.’\(^{538}\) Vollmann strenuously believes that a defining characteristic of being an American is the urge ‘to go out and seek for a piece of paradise.’\(^{539}\) Riding Toward Everywhere is essentially a record of Vollmann’s search for a ‘scuzzy empyrean, the “somewhere” that lurks just around the next bend in the tracks....’\(^{540}\) Basing his search on the legend of ‘Cold Mountain’—a Tang Dynasty hermit-poet named after the wild place that he inhabited and wrote about—Vollmann hops trains and lives the hobo lifestyle because he believes it will lead him to his own version of paradise, a place where he feels that he truly belongs.

Vollmann’s quest is as much a search for ‘Everywhere’ (188)—the name he uses to refer to his version of Cold Mountain—as it is an escape from contemporary


\(^{539}\) Vollmann, Bookworm, KCRW Radio.


\(^{541}\) William T. Vollmann, Riding Toward Everywhere (New York: Ecco, 2008), 72. [All subsequent references in this chapter will be in regard to this edition].
American society, a point he makes abundantly clear when he says: ‘Now I gaze around this increasingly un-American America of mine, and I rage…’ (4). As J. R. Moehringer explains:

The man is miserable. The man is filled with irredeemable gloom about the state of the world. Many of us are filled with irredeemable gloom about the state of the world, but not like Vollmann. So bummed out is he that only one thing gives him relief. Being a bum. A transcient. We’re talking full-on hobo here.542

Hopping trains and being a ‘full-on hobo’ is extremely physically and mentally demanding. In order to ‘catch out’543 on a freight train, Vollmann and his travelling companion, Steve, are required to infiltrate railway facilities by scaling fences, crawling through holes, all the while avoiding the attention of track workers and security officers, as well as belligerent hobos and criminal gangs that could potentially attack and rob them. Even if they manage to access an empty boxcar, they must still contend with broken glass, loose cargo, used syringes, toxic chemicals and severe weather conditions. Moreover, because they do not know where each train is going or when it will stop, they are constantly challenged by the prospect of not having enough food and water to last the journey.

Such unpleasant and hazardous conditions are, for Vollmann, an unavoidable and necessary part of his desire to absolve himself from modern society and enjoy the thrill of riding through the American wilderness in an open boxcar. His intense passion for this activity is exhibited at the very beginning of the book. After relishing the open air and smell of fresh lumber in the gondola, the narrator remarks: ‘That was the great thing about this sort of ride: breathing the air of reality.’ (8). This seemingly innocuous experience resonates so deeply with Vollmann not only because it was so

difficult for him to arrive at this point in the first place but also because he fears that modern civilisation will inevitably encroach upon and destroy the natural environment. He feels obliged, therefore, to appreciate every moment as if it were his last. According to Hikaru Fujii, Vollmann sees America as ‘an uncontrollable force deprived of all transcendent value that guides the traveller and leads his romances to ruin—an immanent force at work everywhere.’\textsuperscript{544} In a brief interlude in his travels, Vollmann visits Cheyenne to see the biggest rodeo in the United States (59), which feeds his distaste for what he calls ‘Plastic America’ (65). As he sits in the stadium watching the bull riders perform in front of an enraptured audience decked out in cowboy hats and ‘full-on Western finery’ (60), he conceives this spectacle as a metaphor for contemporary America, in which most people are content to live their lives vicariously through others, never really understanding what it is like to challenge oneself and have new experiences. Of course, Vollmann is not encouraging people to endanger themselves in the pursuit of experience; his message is simply that life is richer and more rewarding when unfettered by the ‘small and dusty’ (65) windows of a passenger train or the ‘big lights’ (59–60) of a rodeo stadium—it is only by escaping these distractions that one will be in a position to breathe in the ‘air of reality’.

\textit{Riding Toward Everywhere} has been chosen as the last example of MLJ to be analysed because it is the most overtly postmodern and subjective text in the thesis and sits closest to the romantic ideal of literary journalism on Webb’s continuum. Ultimately, it not only raises questions about the limits of referentiality but also about the indeterminacy of the narrating subject. Vollmann refuses to relate this story within a traditional social, cultural or historical framework and, like Raab, he chooses to

CHAPTER 10: Riding Toward Everywhere

depict ‘the image-world as a realm that blurs traditional distinctions between fantasy and reality.’ For example, Vollmann’s narrating self repeatedly uses the phrase: ‘Once upon a time…’ (36), when re-telling stories heard from others or describing his personal experiences from a long time ago, thereby obscuring the actual time frame and undermining the reader’s faith in the veracity of his accounts. The fairytale motif is not limited to this single phrase but is reinforced through the narrator’s repeated use of words such as ‘ogres’ (150) and ‘trolls’ (30) to refer to particularly unlikable hobos. On one occasion, the narrator retells a story about a hobo who had threatened to kill a man he believed to have been responsible for his dog’s death. The narrator explains that the man managed to mollify the hobo by agreeing to bury the dog in his own backyard. The hobo is described as returning ‘like a troll beneath his fairytale bridge…’ (28), at which point the narrator says: ‘I use the word “fairytale” advisedly, because mere nasty actuality might have become mythic eeriness in the telling. To be sure, the warning core of that tale contained truth.’ (28). These comments reveal that the fairytale motif has a journalistic function. The reader is warned that the stories being recounted may not be entirely accurate or reliable because the events, so bizarre and improbable in the first place, have inevitably been distorted in their retelling. This narratological strategy is a characteristic MLJ response to reality and displays Vollmann’s unwillingness to foreclose the question: ‘“Is this real?” by invoking conventional ways of understanding.’

The fairytale motif is one of the many techniques used to blur the traditional distinctions between fantasy and reality in Riding Toward Everywhere. Another
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method involves making the reader aware of the writing process and Vollmann’s presence at a metanarrative level, as illustrated in the following example:

In that cavelike place, which still another colleague’s scrawl officially designated a **HOBO JUNGLE**, a well-wisher expressed determination to **KILL MARY**. It was quite dark now, and it felt sinister to be invading another traveller’s camp, whose owner might misconstrue me violently, so I walked back to my hotel wondering why on earth I compelled myself to hop freight trains; the instant I had reentered the lobby, where the android clerk required my identification before lending me the right to insert my plastic key in my plastic door, the question answered itself; and I recovered my loathing and pity. Why is it preferable to me to hunker grimy and thirsty in a boxcar in order to watch this floating world unhindered by glass, instead of sitting clean, comfortable and legal on a passenger train, whose windows are invariably small and dusty? I knew the answer then even if I have forgotten it now; indeed, at this moment I am sitting on a bullet train between Tokyo and Shin-Osaka, rushing toward Everywhere on my laptop with a beer beside me. Never mind that. How long could this Plastic America last? How long should it last? (65)

At the start of this passage, Vollmann is exploring an abandoned hobo settlement underneath a highway in Cheyenne, having wandered off from Steve and his son earlier on in the evening. Throughout **Riding Toward Everywhere**, Vollmann displays a fascination for hobo graffiti. He records the messages and musings in bold capitalised lettering and provides detailed descriptions of the drawings. On one occasion, Vollmann provides an ideogram to graphically illustrate a person’s initials that had been ‘fashioned into a pair of nippled breasts.’ (76). Vollmann’s affinity for hobo culture and art is illustrated in this passage by the way his narrating self creates a playful association with the first graffiti artist, referring to this person as a colleague, and sardonically dubbing the hobo that wrote ‘**KILL MARY**’ as a ‘well-wisher’.

The tone changes abruptly in the second sentence, however, when the character-bound narrator (CN) states: ‘It was quite dark now, and it felt sinister…so I walked back to my hotel wondering why on earth I compelled myself to hop freight trains….’ Monika Fludernik explains how ‘the “now” in collocation with the past tense draws the reader into the moment of experience, erases the pastness of the..."
The ‘now’ in the passage’s first clause focuses the reader’s attention on the here-and-now of Vollmann’s experiencing self as he begins to feel threatened by the atmosphere at the hobo camp. The coordinating conjunction ‘so’ at the beginning of the third clause (‘so I walked back to my hotel…’) indicates that this sinister atmosphere was the reason why Vollmann’s experiencing self decided to walk back to his hotel (written in the simple past tense), ‘wondering why’ (past continuous) he compels himself to ‘hop freight trains’. The combination of the simple past and past continuous in this part of the sentence indicates that these two actions—walking and thinking—are parallel, occurring at the same time. A semicolon interrupts this event, and the narrative switches to the past perfect as Vollmann’s experiencing self is depicted re-entering the lobby of his hotel. The tense changes back to the simple past when the ‘android clerk’ asks him for identification, and then to the past continuous when he is given ‘the right’ to insert his key into his own door. The subordinating conjunction ‘before’ that joins these two clauses suggests that Vollmann’s right to enter his room is conditional on his showing identification, prompting his realisation as to why he feels so compelled to hop trains (simple past). As a consequence of this awareness, he recovers his ‘loathing and pity’ (simple past).

Hans Reichenbach argues that while ‘tenses determine time with reference to the point of time of the speech act…’, the temporal indications given by the tenses are too complex to be conceived under the conventional indications of ‘before the point of speech’, ‘simultaneous with the point of speech’ or ‘after the point of speech’. This is because there are more than three verb tenses in the English language.

547 Fludernik, *An Introduction to Narratology*, 139.
548 Hans Reichenbach, “The Tenses of Verbs,” in *Time: From Concept to Narrative Construct: a Reader*, eds. Jan Christoph Meister and Wilhelm Schernus (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 2011), 1. [All subsequent references in this chapter will be in regard to this edition].
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Reichenbach thus postulates a theory with three time points: ‘the point of the speech’ (S), ‘the point of the event’ (E) and ‘the point of reference’ (R). These three time points can be illustrated using the clause: ‘a well-wisher expressed determination to KILL MARY....’ The simple past tense indicates that both E and R occurred before S. E and R coincide because the time order expressed in the simple past tense concerns a single event. The formula for this clause is thus: E,R—S. The comma between E and R indicates that they occur at identical time points while the dash is a temporal indicator showing that E and R occurred before S.

The second sentence in the passage is a compound sentence. According to Reichenbach, time points in compound sentences may vary but the ‘tenses of the various clauses are adjusted to one another by certain rules which grammarians call the rules for the sequence of tenses.’ (5). The principle of these rules is that, ‘although the events referred to in the clauses may occupy different time points, the reference point should be the same for all clauses—a principle which…demands the permanence of the reference point.’ (6). For the purposes of clarity, this sentence will be broken up into three sections demarcated by the two semicolons. As explained above, the events in the first section (‘It was quite dark, and it felt sinister...so I walked back to my hotel wondering why on earth I felt compelled to hop freight trains…’) are recounted in the simple past and past continuous, indicating that E and R coincide and precede S, making the formula for section one: E,R—S. However, the adverb ‘now’ in the first clause has a dual-function; it not only focuses the reader’s attention on the here-and-now of Vollmann’s experiencing self but also acts as a time determination that refers, not to the event itself, but to the point of reference of the sentence, which indicates that ‘the reference point is used here as the carrier of the time position.’ (7).
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At the start of the second section of this compound sentence, the CN states: ‘the instant I had reentered the lobby, where the android clerk required my identification… the question answered itself…’. The past perfect tense in the first clause indicates that R is located at a time point between E and S; that is, the time order expressed in this tense covers two events: Vollmann re-entering the lobby (which is in the ‘anterior past’ (10)) and what occurred once he had arrived there (‘simple past’ (10)). Since E and R are in the anterior past and simple past, respectively, and both these time points precede S, the formula for this clause is: E—R—S. The conjunction ‘where’ at the start of the next clause (‘where the android clerk required my identification…’) signals that it is a relative clause. Due to the rules for the sequences of tenses in compound sentences, the time determinations in this clause are identical to those of the previous (main) clause and follow the same formula (E—R—S). As mentioned above, the subordinate conjunction ‘before’ indicates that the clerk asked Vollmann for identification before ‘lending’ him the right to open his door. However, as Reichenbach explains, ‘when time points are compared by means of words like ‘when’, ‘before’, or ‘after’, it is the reference points to which the comparison refers directly, not the events.’ (7). Therefore, even though these two events occur in succession and have separate time points, they are both located in the anterior past because they precede R. In fact, this pattern is typical of the entire sentence, with all of the events occupying different time points in accordance with the chronological order of the narrative. Yet, Reichenbach’s model reveals that the reference point is the same throughout, despite, at times, coinciding with some of these events.

The point of reference of this sentence becomes apparent in the final clause of section two in which Vollmann’s narrating self declares: ‘the question answered
itself…’, revealing that his experiencing self has finally realised why he hops trains.

This revelation is effectively the dénouement of the entire sentence, reflected in the clause’s time determinations (E,R—S) and repeated in the third and final section, when Vollmann’s experiencing self recovers his loathing and pity. This formula (E,R—S) is the same as in the first section of the sentence, revealing that the time determinations given in the tenses have returned to their original state (E,R—S). This symmetry of the time determinations is not coincidental. In section one, the E,R—S reflects Vollmann’s experiencing self, in response to the threatening atmosphere at the hobo camp, losing sight of why he compels himself to hop trains. When the clerk at his hotel reminds him of just how objectionable the alternative to train-hopping is, Vollmann’s experiencing self in section two is once again able to appreciate why he lives the hobo lifestyle—and the formula (E,R—S) returns. Essentially, the events represented in this sentence are structured around first showing what made Vollmann question his reasons for hopping trains and then what led him to overcome these feelings of doubt. Although the reference point is located within this chain of events, it is his loathing and pity of ‘Plastic America’.

Once the progression from doubt to certainty has been documented, the narrator poses the following question: ‘Why is it preferable to me to hunker grimy and thirsty in a boxcar in order to watch this floating world unhindered by glass, instead of sitting clean, comfortable and legal on a passenger train, whose windows are invariably small and dusty?’ This question was intimated when Vollmann’s experiencing self is described as walking back to his hotel wondering why he compelled himself to hop trains. The narrator has depicted that event in the past tense
using ‘indirect discourse’, a form that ‘excludes questions.’ \(^{549}\) By switching to the present tense, Vollmann’s narrating self is able to pose the question directly, which suggests that ‘the time narrated has caught up to the time of narration: the narrator is now narrating in real time.’ \(^{550}\) Consequently, R and S coincide for the first time in the passage, highlighting the ‘Now anchoring point or point of reference of the telling...’ \(^{551}\) and proves that the narrative is seen, not from a reference point situated in the past (i.e., not from an intradiegetic perspective) but from a reference point that coincides with the point of speech: that of the narrator.

With respect to the question itself, the combined effect of the present tense and the personal pronoun ‘me’—which is the objective case of ‘I’—is a shift in narrative focus away from Vollmann’s experiencing self and onto his narrating self. Accordingly, all subsequent uses of the personal pronoun ‘I’ are associated with the narrator, which, with its adoption of an evaluative and critical perspective, has now become the deictic centre of the piece. This transformation is reinforced by the time determinations given in the tenses of the first two clauses of the next sentence (‘I knew the answer then even if I have forgotten it now...’), which can be diagrammed as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1st clause: } & E_1, R_1 \rightarrow S \\
\text{2nd clause: } & E_2 \rightarrow S, R_2
\end{align*}
\]

In the first clause, R precedes S. In the second clause, R has shifted to coincide with S, as the tense structure of the sentence switches from the ‘simple past’ to the ‘anterior present’. The adverb ‘now’ at the end of the second clause is once again a time determination that refers to the point of reference of the sentence; on this
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occasion, however, it draws attention to the here-and-now of Vollmann’s narrating self, rather than his experiencing self. Reichenbach’s model shows that, as the deictic centre of the narrative, Vollmann’s narrating self is able to refer to events involving his experiencing self as ‘then’, and to the temporal location of the narrating as ‘now’.

The temporal and perceptual deictic shift created by this transformation in narratorial perspective has a significant impact on the reader. Michele Morano explains that when a reader is immersed in a story and is suddenly made aware that the narrative ‘represents the work of imagination as much as reality, that it contains at least as much fancy as fact…’, a ‘reality warp’ occurs. Of the many reality warps in Riding Toward Everywhere, one of the most prominent takes place in the first chapter, when the narrator starts describing a ‘lovely black inlet…’ and then suddenly stops, cutting the sentence short with a series of ellipsis marks. The narrator then makes the following remarks in parentheses to indicate that they are not part of the normal discourse: ‘When I read this over, the pallidity of my descriptions appalls me, as if I had failed to make what I saw “real” enough…’ (12). This self-reflexive act is more than a digression interpolated by Vollmann’s narrating self; it is a violation of his role as narrator because he has stopped narrating to comment on the narrative. The reality warp occurs because the comment makes it clear that Vollmann is presiding over the construction and organisation of the narrative. Crucially, the admission that he has not managed to faithfully represent the inlet undermines the reader’s faith in Vollmann’s narrating self and is a reminder that the narrative is as much a product of his consciousness as it is of reality.
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David Eason explains that in RLJ, style is a communicational technique whose function is to reveal a story that exists ‘out there’ in real life whereas in MLJ, style is an epistemological strategy that constructs as well as reveals the real.\textsuperscript{554} When Vollmann’s narrator self stops narrating about a ‘lovely black inlet…’ and becomes self-reflexive, dissecting and critiquing the narrative, he is deliberately disclosing information about how the narratorial process ‘reveals the real’. This common MLJ communicational technique exposes Vollmann’s ‘pervasive authorial presence’\textsuperscript{555} through the act of rendering and re-rendering his experiences into narrative form. Vollmann constantly applies this epistemological strategy throughout \textit{Riding Toward Everywhere}, which is one of the main reasons why it has been positioned on Webb’s continuum as the most subjective work of literary journalism examined in this thesis.

Vollmann’s self-reflexive acts are so visible and disharmonious with the rest of the narrative, however, that there is an obvious tension within the narrator’s discourse. This tension can be seen in the passage above, in which the narrator abandons the preterite—previously used to narrate about the events involving Vollmann’s experiencing self—and begins informing the reader in the present tense about where he is and what he is doing during the act of narration, as shown here: ‘indeed, at this moment I am sitting on a bullet train between Tokyo and Shin-Osaka, rushing toward Everywhere on my laptop with a beer beside me….’ The most challenging aspect of this use of voice is that it situates Vollmann the writer ‘out there’ in reality (on the bullet train, in this case). This is problematic because, as Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson note, this ‘I’ (of Vollmann ‘out there’ in reality) is unknown and unknowable by readers and is not the ‘I’ that readers use to gain access
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into the narrative.\textsuperscript{556} Equally, it is difficult to associate this voice with the narrator because events can only be narrated after they have happened\textsuperscript{557} and this voice is clearly reporting facts in the present tense.

This type of voice cannot be a combination of the narrator and author. As the analysis of the heterodiegetic narrator in \textit{Homicide} (Chapter 5) showed, there is a dissonance between David Simon ‘the author’ and David Simon ‘the narrator’, despite, in typical RLJ fashion, his making every effort to conceal his authorial presence by using a transparent-independent narrator. This proved that a nonfictional narrator is not ‘an ad hoc theoretical construct added on to the author-parameter…’\textsuperscript{558}, despite the clear symbiotic relationship between the narrator and author ‘out there’ in reality. If the narrator were this type of ad hoc theoretical construct, literary journalists would be restricted from using certain literary devices, such as free-indirect prose and the manipulation of point of view and perspective. This is because they intentionally deviate from the author-parameter, which would be beyond the narrator’s remit and therefore a violation of the writer-reader contract. Ultimately, the voice on the bullet train cannot be satisfactorily attributed to any of the communicative agents considered thus far in this thesis, highlighting the need to clarify the nature of narrative communication in literary journalism in order to resolve this predicament.

James Phelan argues that literary journalism theorists have failed to adequately account for the gap between the real author and the narrating-I in nonfiction. A solution is provided by his concept of the implied author (IA) (a variant of the actual author), which is an agent ‘responsible for the multiple of choices that

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{556} Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, \textit{Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 72.  
\textsuperscript{557} Cohn, \textit{The Distinction of Fiction}, 98.  
\textsuperscript{558} Marie-Laure Ryan, “The Narratorial Functions,” 146-59.}
make the text the way it is and not the other way round.' Phelan explains that, as long as the author’s intention is recognised as a legitimate aspect of the text and is ‘accessible through textual phenomena and (partially) testable against reader response’, his theory of the IA is congruent with conventional notions of nonfictional narrative. Authorial intention is critical to the success of Phelan’s theory because, without it, the IA has no ‘terminological link to the sphere of the actual author and authorial values.’ However, according to Phelan, there is an anti-intentionalist orthodoxy in contemporary theory, originating with W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley’s famous essay ‘The Intentionalist Fallacy’. As Peter Lamarque notes, Wimsatt and Beardsley’s article suggests that it is ‘fallacious to base a critical judgement about the meaning or value of a literary work on “external evidence” concerning the author’s intentions.’ Phelan attempts to circumnavigate this problem by suggesting that intention is a mental state—‘a will to do something, including to mean something…’—entirely separate from the meaning of the text, which he says ‘still rests on the public norms governing language.

Phelan’s theory includes Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson’s schema of the four autobiographical ‘I’s—the historical-I of the real author, the narrating-I, the narrated-I, and the ideological-I—as well as his own concept of the IA. The narrating-I and narrated-I are synonymous with the narrating self and experiencing self, respectively. The ideological-I derives from Paul Smith’s theory of the ideological subject, which
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represents ‘the cerned and complete individual which will be called upon to hold in
place the circuit of guarantees obtaining between “subject” and knowledge.’\footnote{Smith and Watson refer to the ideological-I as being ‘at once everywhere and nowhere in autobiographical acts, in the sense that the notion of personhood and the ideologies of identity constitutive of it are so internalized (personally and culturally) that they seem “natural” and “universal” characteristics of persons.’\footnote{The ideological-I is therefore embodied in the fabric of the narrative; it is not a discrete figure like the other autobiographical ‘I’s. In the following passage, Phelan reveals how the five autobiographical ‘I’s’ collectively operate within his theory of autobiographical narration:

The historical-I of the real author remains ultimately inaccessible; the narrating-I
retains the potential for maximal dynamism; the narrated-I retains a similar potential as well as its multiple functions as protagonist; the ideological-I remains the concept of personhood available to the narrating-I in her cultural moment; and the implied author becomes the orchestrator of the shifts in the narrating-I’s voices, in the various representations of the narrated-I, and of their temporal interrelations. This implied author can choose, within the constraints of her own imagination as both constrained and stimulated by her cultural moment, to employ any kind of narrating-I—one in a fixed temporal location; one whose temporal location constantly shifts; one who is naïve; one who is sophisticated and self-conscious; and so on—and can show the stages of the narrated-I’s temporal progression in any order.}\footnote{One of Phelan’s objectives in creating this model was to account for unreliable narration in nonfiction, of which he identifies two main types: ‘deficient’ and ‘unreliable’.\footnote{These two types of “off-kilter” narration can be illustrated using the example of the ‘lovely long black inlet…’ in the first chapter of *Riding Toward Everywhere*. According to Phelan’s model, the implied Vollmann orchestrates a shift in the narrating-I’s voice and is therefore responsible for transforming a relatively identifiable-dependent narrative voice in teller mode (located in the main body of the}
text) into an extremely identifiable-dependent narrative voice (in parentheses)—one that dissects and undermines the representational efficacy of the narrative. Luc Herman and Bart Vervaek explain how the IA ‘does not actually appear in the text. He does not have an audible voice, and yet he forms part of the narrative. He constitutes the source for the aggregate of norms and opinions that makes up the ideology of the text.’ The IA is therefore similar to the ideological-I in that it is part of the fabric of the narrative but not a discrete ‘I’; that is, it does not have a discernible voice or point of view. However, in the ‘lovely black inlet…’ example, the voice in parentheses is still part of the narrator’s discourse despite being entirely distinct from the narrator that is narrating in the main body of the text. It is reasonable to assume that this metanarrative voice in parentheses converges with the IA because the voice signals a gap between the views of the IA and those of the narrator in the main body of the text, causing the latter narrator to appear ‘unreliable’. ‘Deficient’ narration can be seen when the opposite occurs, that is, when the gap between the IA and narrating-I is unintended. To explain ‘deficient’ narration, the following passage from Riding Toward Everywhere is scrutinised using Phelan’s model of the five ‘I’s:

And I felt that I was about to do a bad deed. I did it, crushing the mouse on the first blow, making sure on the second, which destroyed the remnants of its beauty forever, its brown silky fur now sodden, disheveled and grey with water, blood and dirt. It lay on its side, as disgustingly shapeless as if it had drowned and gone rotten days before. I scooped it up on the dustpan, not without multiple efforts, since it was disintegrating, then opened the door and flicked it over the ditch and into the weeds. A quarter-hour later the flies were on it, and by the end of the day it was gone.

Who was I, to do such a thing? Aside from any guilt that might accrue me—although I would have been guilty to let an infected animal go, and perhaps guilty of cruelty to the mouse itself not to end its suffering, if it was in fact suffering, of which I saw no indication (and so because I insist on my righteousness and have not yet done insisting on it, I probably do feel guilty)—there is also the issue of sadness; I feel sad whenever I take a life, and when I remember my role in the death of any creature, even years later, my sadness comes back, as it does now; and there is finally the matter of disgust; at myself, at the presence of the mouse (not the mouse itself) for putting me in this position, at the sad little corpse which I’d ruined just as the cat would have—surely
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more mercifully than the cat, but on the other hand, I reasoned my way into doing it; I chose to do it; humanly atrocious behavior is excusable in a cat on the basis of instinct; in short, who was I?—Guilty, sad, disgusted and disgusting, reasonable, courageous and kind, a murderer who held his head up high. (108-9)

In the first paragraph of this passage, the narrator is describing the actions of Vollmann’s experiencing self in killing an infected mouse. The narrative voice is identifiable-dependent and in teller mode because it can be clearly seen telling the story. At the start of the second paragraph, the narrating-I becomes self-reflexive, saying: ‘Who was I, to do such a thing?’ The posing of this question draws the reader’s attention to the here-and-now of Vollmann’s narrating self, which becomes the deictic centre of the passage from this point onwards. However, the gap that is created between his narrating self and his experiencing self immediately collapses in the next sentence, when the narrator states: ‘Aside from any guilt that might accrue me….’ Ronald W. Langacker suggests several ways in which subject and object participants can be dealt with in circumstances where the same individual fills the roles normally coded by the clausal subject (the narrating-I) and the direct object (the narrated-I).\(^{570}\) Langacker reveals that a common strategy in first-person narratives ‘is to code the participant twice, by means of the usual subject and object pronouns.’\(^{571}\) The narrator at the beginning of the second paragraph does exactly this, coding itself initially as the subject (‘Who was I [my italics], to do such a thing?’) and then as the object (‘Aside from any guilt that might accrue me [ibid.]…’). This double coding allows the narrator to fill both the subject and object roles, making it appear that the narrating-I and the narrated-I have coincided—at least temporarily—as if Vollmann’s narrating self is now standing in situ in the immediate aftermath of this incident, contemplating the actions of his experiencing self.


The narrator’s contemplation of the incident is interrupted by an em dash in the second sentence of paragraph two, signalling a break in thought. Vollmann’s narrating self is once more coded as the subject (‘although I [my italics] would have been guilty…’) as he considers what the implications might have been had his experiencing self let the mouse go (assuming that this might have prolonged its suffering). In an about-turn, Vollmann’s narrating self reconsiders this supposition and concedes that there is no irrefutable way of knowing whether the mouse was suffering or not. A deictic shift takes place as the narrator starts narrating from a position that appears to be perceptually located within the events\textsuperscript{572} (‘of which I saw no indication…’), in order to determine whether he had made the right decision in exterminating the mouse in the first place. This is, of course, a contrivance. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the use of the preterite indicates that the events are seen retrospectively, underlining ‘the clear (though unspecified) temporal distance that separates the narrating self from the experiencing self.’\textsuperscript{573} The narrator’s double coding creates the impression that it is positioned in the same temporal location as Vollmann’s experiencing self—as if it were standing at the scene—but this is of course impossible because, as Doritt Cohn has explained, events can only be narrated after they have happened.\textsuperscript{574} The narrating could not have started until Vollmann was in a position to start writing. To do this, he would have needed the necessary tools, such as a pen and paper or a computer. Even if these were at hand at the time, which is highly improbable considering he discovered and killed the mouse in a bathroom, Vollmann’s narrating self cannot look at the mouse for signs of suffering because his experiencing self has already disposed of the body. Therefore, even though it appears

\textsuperscript{573} Cohn, \textit{Transparent Minds}, 151.
\textsuperscript{574} Cohn, \textit{The Distinction of Fiction}, 98.
that the narration is in reflector mode, and focalized from an intradiegetic perspective, the narrator is in fact simply referring to what Vollmann’s experiencing self saw at the time due to the discursive relevance of this observation.

A voice in parentheses then interjects: ‘and so because I insist on my righteousness and have not yet done insisting on it, I probably do feel guilty….’ As with the voice in parentheses in the ‘lovely black inlet…’ example, this metanarrative voice objectifies the narrator in the main body of text (‘I insist on my righteousness…’) and exposes how it conveys and constructs reality (‘and have not yet done insisting on it…’). The interjection is also set in a post-narrative temporal location and reveals Vollmann’s ‘pervasive authorial presence’. This voice is intended to be taken for an actual voice ‘out there’ in reality, although it is in fact a different narrating-I to the narrating-I in the main body of text, one which coincides with the implied Vollmann. The admission that ‘I probably do feel guilty…’ (in parentheses in the final clause) indicates a gap between the IA’s views and those of the narrator (in the main body of text). This gap suggests that the narration is unreliable and creates a reality warp because it reminds the reader that the narrative is a work of consciousness rather than a story that exists ‘out there’ in reality.

Another em dash is used to indicate a break in thought as the narrator shifts the focus from guilt to the ‘issue of sadness’. As the narrator explains that having any role in an animal’s death causes feelings of sadness, the characteristics of the ideological-I become apparent and the reader begins to conceive Vollmann’s narrating self as a figure with a great deal of empathy for other living creatures and passionately objecting to the needless killing of, or cruelty to, animals. When the narrator states: ‘as it does now’, in reference to feeling sad, it is easy to assume that this describes feelings felt by Vollmann’s experiencing self. However, the adverb
'now’ in this clause is a time determination identifying the point of reference of the sentence, drawing attention to the here-and-now of the narrator. It is Vollmann’s narrating self that is feeling sad about the mouse because he is once again remembering his role in the death of a creature; there is no mention of what Vollmann’s experiencing self felt at the time. This is confirmed when the narrator moves on to the topic of disgust, explaining that he felt disgust at himself (for killing the mouse), at the presence of the mouse (not the mouse itself) for putting him in this position, and at ‘the sad little corpse’ which he’d ‘ruined just as the cat would have…’. The narrator is thereby explaining his disgust at two things: the presence of the mouse for putting his experiencing self in the position where he felt obliged to kill it and the corpse itself—or, his memory of it, to be exact—that his experiencing self ruined.

The penultimate em dash is used to concentrate the discourse on the subject of how mercifully the cat would have killed the mouse. Vollmann’s narrating self is almost pleading his case that he was ‘surely more merciful than the cat…’ and then bemoaning his liability as a human with the capacity to feel empathy and compassion for other life forms. He admits that: ‘I reasoned my way into doing it; I chose to do it…’ and so on, which leads him to ask the question: ‘in short: who was I?’—broader and more existential than the one he poses at the beginning of the paragraph. Significantly, the narrator poses this second question in the past tense, signalling that the question, and its answer, relate to Vollmann’s experiencing self, even though his narrating self has been the one considering this topic. Then, with a final em dash, the narrator lists all the emotions and character traits explored in this second paragraph by way of answering this question. Some of these are conflicting, illustrating the mixed emotions that the IA feels about this act of ‘mercy’.
At the end of the chapter with the mercy killing of the mouse, the narrator starts reminiscing about a time when Vollmann’s experiencing self was in Alaska and an Eskimo woman, who was part Irish, told him about a place where it was possible to catch animals, such as squirrels and seals. The narrator then admits that Vollmann’s experiencing self imagines going hunting with her and, not long after, ‘was driving down Front Street with a professional hunting guide…’ (115). By this point in the narrative, Vollmann’s narrating self had already explained how abhorrent his experiencing self finds killing animals and how he struggles to cope with the sadness, guilt and disgust of his actions afterwards. Yet, the narrator was now presenting Vollmann’s experiencing self as fantasising about going hunting with the Eskimo woman and not long after driving down Front Street with a hunting guide. Although the narrator does not specify whether Vollmann’s experiencing self was going to go through with the hunting and killing of wild animals, its position is not consistent with the concept of personhood created by the ideological-I during the mercy killing episode. Clearly, there is a problem with the ‘purposeful design of the narrative…’575 because there is no suggestion by either the narrating-I or the implied Vollmann that there is a contradiction in this passage. This is an instance of ‘deficient’ narration because the gap between the views of the narrating-I and the IA are unintended.

The analysis of Riding Toward Everywhere presented in this chapter has shown that Vollmann’s strategy of exposing how narrative constructs as well as reveals the ‘real’ is at times so extreme that particular voices cannot be attributed to particular communication agents. These agents include the Vollmann ‘out there’ in reality, his narrating self, his experiencing self, and any other actors featuring in the text. There is clearly a need for a clarification of narrative communication in literary

575 Phelan, “The Implied Author, Deficient Narration, and Nonfiction Narrative,” 130.
journalism to provide a way of defining and analysing the radical indeterminacy of
the writing subject displayed in texts such as this. James Phelan’s theory is
particularly appealing in this regard because it introduces the concepts of the
ideological-I and the IA, which enable theorists to isolate and analyse non-discrete
figures that impact on the way nonfictional first person narratives are conceived. The
IA also offers a way of discussing authorial intention in a way that avoids confusing it
with the separate meaning of the text, allowing theorists to consider the orchestrator
of the narrative as distinct from the narrator’s discourse—in which there can be a
multitude of differing and conflicting voices. Ultimately, though, this examination of
*Riding Toward Everywhere* shows the extent to which MLJ goes to make the reader
aware of how intimately involved the writer’s consciousness is in the symbolic act of
revealing the real in narrative form.
Conclusion

This thesis has proposed a new way in which to categorise literary journalism texts using Eason’s typology of RLJ and MLJ, in conjunction with Webb’s continuum. The six primary texts have been systematically ordered and arranged not only according to the way in which each journalist has responded to reality and organised the experience of reporting, but also according to the extent to which each text has been influenced by the journalistic ideals of rationalism or romanticism. Tom Barone argues that the degree to which nonfiction narratives tolerate ‘ambiguity, imagination or creativity—indeed subjectivity of any sort—they may be diminished in terms of reliability, validity and objectivity….’

This thesis has argued that ambiguity, imagination and creativity are an essential and unavoidable part of the narratorial process, one that does not necessarily diminish the reliability, validity and objectivity of the story. Instead, by actively drawing attention to these subjective processes, literary journalism reveals that narrative is always a matter of rhetoric and always subjective because the writer is required to select and interpret in order to tell the story, irrespective of how ‘objective’ it appears. By foregrounding its rhetorical and narrative imperatives, literary journalism lays claim to a more authentic verisimilitude, at the same time reinforcing its aesthetic appeal.

One of the primary aims of this thesis has been to evaluate each text on epistemological grounds and analyse them using aesthetic criteria. For this reason, in addition to Eason’s typology and Webb’s continuum, Carvalho’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodological framework and Kunelius’ narrative voice model

577 Sims, True Stories, 12.
were adopted for the close readings. Carvalho’s CDA framework offers a set of strategies for analysing key external factors, such as the writers’ reportorial methods, their access and exposure to the events reported, their relationship with actors, and their intentions in telling the stories. This framework has also contributed a contextual component to the Textual Analysis (TA), allowing competing historical accounts, witness testimonies and interviews, and various secondary sources of information to be considered in parallel with the close readings so that each text can be evaluated on epistemological grounds. Kunelius’ narratological model was chosen for analysing the aesthetic features of the texts due to its clear and pragmatic approach which can be used in conjunction with the wide variety of concepts and theories that needed to be marshalled in order to elucidate the individual readings. Moreover, as noted above, one of the fundamental ways that RLJ can be distinguished from MLJ is through the visibility of the narrating subject and its relation to the diegesis. The two dimensions of narration that Kunelius’ model specifies—visibility and dependency—are effective ways in which to identify and distinguish between these two modes of literary journalism.

Another aim of this thesis was to reinvigorate the debate over how to define a form that blurs the boundaries between literature and journalism and to refute Phillip Smallwood’s claim that this genre cannot be defined by its intrinsic attributes alone. The analysis of *Homicide* showed that, despite its rationalist approach, this text exemplifies RLJ in its attempts to close the epistemological gap between the reader and the ‘reality’ depicted in the narrative, which is characteristic of the romantic ideal of journalism. Simon’s use of various literary techniques—second-person perspective, free indirect prose, and close third person combined with the distanced observation of character—illustrates how RLJ can engage with reality in an explicitly self-conscious
and postmodern fashion, based on the assumption that telling a story is not an innocent act involving a natural sequence of events which are merely ‘extracted’ or recounted.\textsuperscript{578} The analysis of \textit{Schindler’s Ark} showed how Keneally’s writing accommodated the ambiguity and complexity of Oskar Schindler’s life and depicts events in a factually conscientious way whilst simultaneously conveying what he sees as the spiritual significance of these events. To achieve this, he uses a multi-faceted approach including a histor narrator and modalisation, along with other grammatical mechanisms and indicators. The third and final RLJ text examined in this thesis, \textit{The Art of Political Murder}, illustrates how externally verifiable inanimate objects—in this case, roads, buildings and statues—can be incorporated into an RLJ narrative in a rhetorically meaningful way. Collectively, these analyses demonstrate that, despite RLJ’s ostensibly neutral and matter-of-fact way of depicting reality, as a form of literary journalism, it ‘stands as a humanistic approach to culture as compared to the scientific, abstract, or indirect approach taken by much standard journalism.’\textsuperscript{579} The narrator stands alongside the subject, and in accord with it, in order to reveal it as clearly as possible without intruding overtly, and while nevertheless making use of a shaping hand.

The analysis of \textit{The First Stone} examined the complex relationship between the narrating self and the experiencing self in first-person narratives. It shows that in MLJ, a character-bound narrator can have a dual function: narrating about the past from an extradiegetic perspective as a ‘witness’ or operating as a transparent, technical means of communication that gives the reader unimpeded access to the experiencing self’s consciousness as a ‘participant’. Scott Raab’s \textit{The Whore of Akron} \textsuperscript{578} Nicol, \textit{The Cambridge Introduction to Postmodern Fiction}, 27. \textsuperscript{579} Sims, \textit{True Stories}, 12.
illustrates how MLJ is an innately self-reflexive mode of literary journalism, in which the reporter chronicles and explores the interaction between consciousness and events. Finally, the analysis of *Riding Toward Everywhere* elucidated how Vollmann’s refusal to relate his story within a traditional social, cultural or historical framework was achieved by a blurring of the traditional distinctions between fantasy and reality. The analysis also revealed the way in which Vollmann’s self-reflexive and pervasive authorial presence deliberately causes disharmony and tension within the narrator’s discourse, demonstrating that MLJ ‘seeks to create for the reader the disorder that interpretations transform, the experiential contradictions that usually remain outside the text.’ Together, the findings derived from these analyses show how the overtly subjective presence of the narrating subject in MLJ allows the journalist to use an internally defined reality to help explain the objective facts to which traditional journalists are welded. In contrast to RLJ, the narrator of MLJ invites the reader inside the subject to observe first-hand the indeterminacy and complexity of the real.

The essential difference between RLJ and MLJ is the narrator’s relationship to the image world. In RLJ, the narrator has a disassociated engagement with the actors and events depicted in the narrative but is not strictly ‘omniscient’ because the narrative voice is never entirely transparent, either adopting the style and manner of speech of an actor using free indirect prose (FIP) or reporting ‘general social knowledge in tones approximating those of a tour guide, a gossip columnist, or a university professor, depending on the exact object of social knowledge at hand.’

---

581 Ibid., 62.
That is, the narrator is alongside the subject, exhibiting familiarity with it but not an all-encompassing or proprietorial knowledge. This is illustrated by Simon’s combined close third person (CTP) with the distant observation of a character (DOC) in *Homicide*.

In MLJ, the narrator is no longer distant from the real as a knowable entity, and has a more complex engagement with the actors and events than in RLJ. Since MLJ is written from within the image world, the narrator’s subjectivity is contingent on the environment—seeing, experiencing and reporting on it from within its confines. To some extent, the narrator is defined by that experience and indistinguishable from it because its cognitive processes are in a state of emergence rather than a state of being. In its most extreme form, this type of narrative results in the disappearance of the external narrative medium (the third-person or authorial narrator) by becoming consumed by internal thoughts and perceptions, as exemplified by the radical indeterminacy of the writing subject in *Riding Toward Everywhere*.

Given the limitations of this study—confined to six close readings—there is scope for testing the framework on a broader range of texts. Such an exercise could provide an opportunity to further refine the typology and perhaps contribute additional categories along the RLJ/MLJ continuum. Further, the analysis of the heterodiegetic narrator in *Homicide* and the radical indeterminacy of the writing subject in *Riding Toward Everywhere* indicate a need for greater clarification with respect to narrative communication in literary journalism. Norman Sims notes that literary journalism can be seen as a narrative impulse in journalism. Clearly, narrative should be a prime focus in the analysis of literary journalism. However, it is

---

equally important that this type of discourse is recognised as a representation of actual events, which are independent of any particular narrative perspective or presentation.\textsuperscript{587}

In addition to providing the tools for close analysis and a typology and spectrum for organising a wide variety of individual literary journalism texts, this thesis shows how the fundamental honouring of the factual, which differentiates literary journalism from fiction or fictual prose, enhances its status as a form of news. Literary journalism is anchored in fact, even where the reader’s access to facts may be problematized by the narrator’s relationship to the subject and the narrator’s construction of self. Every literary journalist acknowledges a responsibility to the real—as constituted by fact and narrative technique—and must at all times ensure that it is respected and honoured in the documentary core of the text. Yet, responsibility by definition is the ability or authority to act on one’s own,\textsuperscript{588} so it is vitally important that these writers be given the right to respond to the real without having their work discredited as mere story telling or ‘yet another branch of the entertainment industry….\textsuperscript{589}’ Until literary journalism is recognised and respected as a particular kind of news, and theorists reach a consensus on how to define and analyse this constantly evolving genre, its rich interior will continue to remain underexplored.

\textsuperscript{587} Culler, \textit{The Pursuit of Signs}, 109.
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