



Image by Benjamin D. Buren

Scholar-Practitioner Q&A . . .

An Interview with Sara Davidson

Lisa A. Phillips
SUNY New Paltz, United States

Keywords: New Journalism – women writers – first person – immersion

Journalist, novelist, and screenwriter Sara Davidson found her voice in the heyday of the New Journalism. As one of the few women regularly associated with the genre, she is credited with bringing an intimately personal perspective to bear, using the first-person point of view and including details of her own life in her work. She rose to fame in 1977 with the international best seller *Loose Change*,¹ the story of three women whose lives were shaped by the social revolution of the 1960s. Much of her writing is situated on the border between fact and fiction, combining literary techniques with rigorous reporting.

Born in 1943, Davidson grew up in Los Angeles and went to Berkeley in the 1960s, writing for the *Daily Cal*.² She attended the Columbia School of Journalism and then spent the first years of her career as a national correspondent for the *Boston Globe*, covering Woodstock, the student strike at Columbia, and the political campaigns of Robert F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon. While freelancing for *Harper's*, *Esquire*, the *Atlantic*, the *New York Times Magazine*, *Rolling Stone*, and other publications, she honed the art of immersive narrative journalism. She wrote about rock 'n' roll, the singles scene, polygamy, Israel, the back-to-the-land movement, radical feminism, and the search for a home in counterculture Venice Beach, California, during the real estate boom of the 1970s. Her influential collection, *Real Property*, was published in 1980.³ She is featured in *The Literary Journalists*, edited by Norman Sims.⁴

Since the heyday of the New Journalism, Davidson has continued to write books. Recent titles include *The December Project*,⁵ a dialogue with renowned Rabbi Zalman Schachter-Shalomi about death; and *Joan: Forty Years of Life, Love, and Friendship with Joan Didion*, a Kindle single.⁶ Davidson has written extensively for television and was the co-executive producer for *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman*.⁷ She lives in Boulder, Colorado.

Lisa A. Phillips: You trained as a traditional journalist. How did you break free from that to become part of what we now recognize as the New Journalism?

Sara Davidson: It started out being called the New Journalism, and then later had different names: literary journalism or personal journalism. I went to get a master's degree at the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism after getting an undergraduate degree at the University of California, Berkeley, in English. I must tell you, I wasn't sure whether I wanted to go to journalism school or pursue a PhD in English—because I loved it. My faculty advisor in the English department said, "I can't encourage you, because women are really not welcome on this faculty." Out of the whole English faculty, there was one woman poet and that was it. That pushed me over the edge. I'm glad that I was pushed because I've had a wonderful experience as a journalist.

Columbia at that time was the primo place to go for, if you wanted to go into journalism. But we were trained as if we were going to work for the Associated Press, United Press International, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, or one of the other big newspapers. We were brainwashed into learning you never say the word "I." At the *Times* they would write "this reporter" if they needed to say something that concerned them.

Phillips: They still do that.

Davidson: In the news articles they do, but then they've gotten a lot looser throughout the paper, particularly in the magazine section, the book review, or features. There's Taffy Brodesser-Akner's profiles in the magazine section, for example, in which she totally is there as a presence and giving her opinions all the time.

Phillips: At times she is as much a presence as her subjects.

Davidson: None of that was done in the 1960s. Even for magazines, if you were writing a reported story, you never said the word "I." There was this idea of objectivity. I later came to see that nobody is objective. You can assert that you are and take pains to show both sides of an issue, but nobody's objective. No matter how hard you try, it's really an elusive thing. Your choice of what quotes to use, what details you say, all reflect the individual's bias. My first job was with the *Boston Globe*. Then I started writing for magazines.

After having a number of proposals rejected, my first piece was for *Harper's*. My husband had a friend who was one of the editors there, and I was able to go and pitch a story to him. The story I proposed was going on the road with a young rock group. Now, this was the late '60s, when people didn't know that much about rock groups, what it was like to tour. The editor said, "You'll have to do it on spec, of course, which means we won't guarantee to pay you or buy it or anything, but you can try." I went on the road with the band Rhinoceros and took feverish notes. I mean, I was taking notes all the time. I struggled with writing it, then turned it in, and it was accepted. That was my first piece for a magazine.⁸

Phillips: Did you have a particular writer in mind as you transitioned into magazine work?

Davidson: Lillian Ross. She never uses the word "I." But her point of view is so clear by the details she chooses. You can tell if she's for or against what she's writing or what her opinion is just by the way she accrues details. Her work was my model for how to write a good magazine article. You wrote scenes, you wrote details, you did interviews, and you put it together. It was all about your eye, really. What you noticed. You learn more by watching somebody and spending a lot of time with them in what we called "shadowing," or intensive reporting. With the Rhinoceros article, I hung around the band for, I think, almost a month, on and off. I saw what happened, and I heard what they said. I presented a picturesque story about what it's like to be in your early twenties on the road as an aspiring rock group.

Then I did a number of pieces for *Harper's*, and they were pretty much all in that way. It's interesting, because I was recently asked to submit my *Harper's* profile of Jacqueline Susann,⁹ the author of *Valley of the Dolls*, for an anthology. I read it again, after—I hate to say—more than fifty years. I was shocked, because I never used the word "I," but it was so clearly a hatchet job. I picked details that made her look ridiculous, and her husband too. To tell you the truth, I was ashamed about it.

Phillips: What do you mean?

Davidson: They were such easy hits. She was promoting her novel, *The Love Machine*. Everything she and her husband said out of their mouths was ridiculous. I just wrote it all down and reported it. What startled me is I never said "I" in it, yet I clearly did not think much of her literary abilities. She would give quotes like, "I'm a today writer. The novel has to compete with television and the movies. It has to come alive quickly and be easy to read. When people tell you they couldn't put the book down, that is good writing."¹⁰ She and her husband were easy to make fun of. It was just everything they said, the way they operated, the way they dressed. I'm telling

you, afterward I was not proud of that piece, because it was a takedown. Afterward, I had a transition in my own life where I decided I didn't want to do that anymore. I only wanted to write about people that I respected, or I thought were interesting or doing compelling things. I didn't want to just go after somebody that was easy to make fun of.

Phillips: Who influenced you as you made this shift?

Davidson: Tom Wolfe was writing pieces that appeared in *New York* magazine, and before that, for the *New York Herald Tribune*. He was just breaking all the barriers. If he described himself, it was as the man in the white suit. He didn't say "I" either. But he had these pyrotechnic displays of word usage, this whole style. You just read him to read him. It was so enjoyable—it didn't matter what he was writing about.

Then there were those who were doing what I would call personal journalism. Joan Didion was the perfect example. Her voice was always the voice of "I, the writer, am talking to you, the reader, and here's what I want you to know, and here's what I want you to see, and this is what I did, and this is what I thought." She's giving her opinions about everything, and they're so brilliant. They hit home. You feel a sense of, "Oh, my God, she just put into words something I've felt but never been able to articulate." I was a big early fan. Luckily, I came to meet her through a mutual acquaintance. She became my mentor and my model. I was very close to her and her husband, John Gregory Dunne. I lived in Los Angeles, and they lived in Malibu. I spent a lot of time with her. When I wrote my first book, *Loose Change*, I had so much trouble with the introduction. I'd rewritten it twenty times—I just couldn't get it. I called her up, crying, and said, "I just can't do this. I don't know what to do." She said, "Come out here, and we'll look at it." It was six pages long. I'll never forget, she put all the pages on the table, three on top, and then three on the bottom, so she could look back and forth between the pages. My secret hope was she would read it and say, "Oh, it's fine. You're just torturing yourself." But she read it and then she said, "You're really having trouble with this, aren't you?" My heart sank. Then she made a few suggestions: "Let's move this here; maybe you could say this here." Somehow, she helped me make it work. That's how she and John would write their pieces. They would write little bits, and then spread them out on the floor and see what bits go where. They don't teach you to do that in journalism school.

Phillips: I found it fascinating to read *Loose Change* after reading the Rhinoceros profile and your other early magazine work that doesn't use the first person, because in *Loose Change* you bring the "I" back in as you recount your experiences of what it was like to report these pieces. In that way we directly experience your opinions, your point of view, and where you were at,

personally and professionally, as you shadowed your subjects. I'm wondering as you wrote *Loose Change* what that process was like. What did you come to understand about the role of the "I"?

Davidson: Because I admired the work of people who were using it, specifically Joan and John, I just transitioned to it. Nobody told me to. I didn't consciously make a decision. I have to tell you, though, the first times I did, I was so self-conscious. It was a big deal to break through that barrier. Then there was a point at which that's pretty much all I did. I was always in the piece. I got very comfortable with it.

I tried many times to write a novel because I was brought up to believe that real literature was novels. Journalists were in a lower echelon. Every time I tried, it never got published or just didn't work. When I first tried to write the novel that would become *Cowboy*,¹¹ I wrote with a character who was like me and named something else. All the characters were from my life, but they had different names. I took liberties with what they said and how I portrayed them. I finished a draft, and people close to me made it clear that it just didn't work. I said, "Well, I can't write it up as a personal piece, because it's about my ex-husband, and my current lover, and my children. Even if I were to get permission from my ex-husband and my current lover, how would the kids give permission?" I couldn't ask my children because they wouldn't know what they were agreeing to. It wouldn't be a fair thing to ask of them. I told this to the very good novelist Jo-Ann Mapson, who is a friend of mine. She said, "Look, write it as a journalist. Write it as if nobody's ever going to read it. You don't have to worry about anybody's feelings or their reactions. Then you'll sit down with your editor and a lawyer and figure out how you can publish it." So I did that. I'd spent probably a year and a half writing that first draft. When I just let loose and did it the way I wrote my other journalism, it was done in two months. Jo-Ann said, "It's only like 500 percent better!" I realized that my best voice, the voice in which I'm most confident, is when I am speaking as truthfully and as honestly as I can. I realized that my greatest power as a writer was as what I call the intimate journalist, where I am clear that I am telling you the story with my own prejudices and perspectives, and I'm being as honest as I can. I've never gone back and tried to write any other way.

Phillips: Why the intimate journalist? If it's your own story, why isn't it just the intimate writer, or the intimate human being?

Davidson: I was trained as a journalist to be observant and watchful. It's my intention to write as a journalist who speaks about what she's lived through, what she's known, and the people she's met.

Phillips: Given that "intimate journalist" is the term for how you're see-

ing yourself and the way you work, what is the most comfortable description of the resulting books when there is some degree of fictionalization?

Davidson: The bookstores don't know what to do with them. *Cowboy* was put in fiction. *Loose Change* was put in nonfiction, though people think it was a novel, and that was as close to journalism as I could come. I mean, I took a lot of liberties. For example, one of the characters told me that after her husband left, they had a big argument, and he didn't come back for months. I said, "Well, what was the argument about?" She said she didn't remember. I didn't want to just say they had a big argument, and he left. I wanted you to see the argument. So, I created an argument based on what I knew of her and him, and what I thought her voice was like and his voice was like. So, what would you call *Loose Change*? Would you call it nonfiction or fiction? What would you call it?

Phillips: You're asking me? You know, I thought a lot about this. Certainly, preparing for this interview, I read it like a memoir. You explain your process at the beginning of the book, and, to me, the most important part is the transparency.

Davidson: That's where I came down, and I was even more transparent with *Cowboy*. When you have changed names, when you have altered history, or put things in different order, you just have to acknowledge that and then you're off the hook. This is the best way I could tell the story. My friend Steve Wasserman, who was then the editor of the *Los Angeles Times Book Review*, said to call it a nonfiction novel, which was Truman Capote's term.¹² But when it made the *Los Angeles Times* bestseller list, they put it in the fiction list, even though it was published as nonfiction. I don't think there is a strict definition of what's fiction and what's not. But if you are going to be a literary journalist and call yourself a journalist, which I do, you have to try your best to tell the truth as you experienced it.

Phillips: One thing I wanted to ask you about is what it was like to be a female New Journalist. The way the New Journalism is often discussed, there's this core of male writers, plus Joan Didion. Then there are a number of women, including yourself, who in some accounts are considered prominent in the New Journalism and in some are not. You're not mentioned in Marc Weingarten's book *The Gang That Wouldn't Write Straight*,¹³ for example, though literary journalism scholars such as Jan Whitt and Norman Sims see you very much as part of that phenomenon, and your work is widely anthologized. Why do you think women have a less certain place in the New Journalism?

Davidson: At first, it was hard for me to get a job at all. After I graduated from the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, people would tell me: "We're not hiring women, because we can't send you to a riot. We can't send

you to a fire. You can't carry heavy equipment"—if I wanted a TV job. They were outspoken about not hiring women. But when I began writing for magazines, I did not run into that. I can't say that there were any barriers to me writing for magazines, which was the primo expression of the New Journalism. It was in *Harper's*. It was in *Esquire*. It was in the *Atlantic*. It was in *New York* magazine. There were a lot of women who were doing it, so I didn't feel that there was any barrier there. I applied for a job at the *New York Times* as a reporter, and they wouldn't take me. They never said why. They just said, "A decision has been made on your case, and it's not favorable." Yet, I could write for the *New York Times Magazine* and for the book review. It was this funny thing where with the strict journalism jobs, there was outright discrimination against women. When I went to my first job at the *Boston Globe*, they wanted me to work in the travel section, which sounds romantic, but you read AP and UPI stories about travel and rewrote them. It was not the job I wanted. But it was supposed to start in September, and I graduated from Columbia in June. I wrote to the editor and said, "I can come to work earlier than September if I can just come as a general assignment reporter or do something else before I go to the travel section." I didn't let on about how I did not want to be a travel writer. He said, "Sure, come," so I went into the pool, and they liked the kind of reporting I was doing. When September came along, I did not move to the travel section. But that was a quirk. I snuck in the back way.

Phillips: What do you think women were bringing to the table that male New Journalists were not? And is that even the right way to think about it?

Davidson: I wouldn't think that way. I really wouldn't. We didn't feel we were in a separate category at all. We all read each other's stuff and talked about it. There was no feeling that the men were better than the women. It's only in retrospect that some idiots have decided who was in and who wasn't.

Phillips: What are the idiots getting wrong?

Davidson: I don't know. You'd have to ask them. I have no idea. I just can tell you that I did not experience any discrimination or any barriers as a magazine journalist. Thank God, you know, because I wouldn't be here where I am today, sitting here trying to write another book.

Phillips: How would you describe your contribution to the New Journalism?

Davidson: It's what everybody offers. Your "I" and your voice. You know, Nora Ephron used to say there are three key things in writing: Voice, voice, and voice.¹⁴ It's like real estate: location, location, location. You have a voice, and you don't work to get it. You just naturally have a voice. If I read a piece of yours, it wouldn't read like a piece by one of your colleagues. Capturing dialogue is also important. Scenes are important. When I was at the *Globe*, before

I even read Tom Wolfe's essay [in *New York*] on the New Journalism,¹⁵ I was doing what came to be called the New Journalism, in terms of selecting the description and the quotes that would make somebody come across. When I'm reporting, as I'm with my subjects, I'm constantly writing, capturing their sentences. You've got to write fast or you have a tape recorder or something. Capturing people's voices is incredibly important. I wrote a piece for *Esquire* about four women who had been key in the early days of the women's liberation movement.¹⁶ One of them was Kate Millett. Afterwards, she said, "You know, I was amazed. You got my voice, you got my speech, exactly as I said it." I said, "Yeah, I wrote it down." Dialogue is important, as is moving from scene to scene, rather than just describing overall what's happening.

Phillips: Covering faith and belief, whether it's a religious or a spiritual path or a movement, is a remarkable and difficult thing. One aspect of your work I'm really fascinated by, and from what I've read about your life, is there's this interesting tension between covering a subject and the pull either to believe in it or be influenced by it. Can you talk about that?

Davidson: I wouldn't say I'm a person of faith. I am a seeker. I'm a spiritual seeker. I've always been a seeker. I remember even at Columbia Journalism School, my best friend was asked, "What's Sara like?" and she said, "Sara is a quester." That word was a precedent to seeker. I define myself as a skeptical seeker. My mind just doesn't quit. Any time I hear any doctrine or any description of the afterlife by anybody, I say, "How do you know that? Maybe that's not true." My whole life has been a journey toward—I hate to use the words—self and self-awareness, self-improvement, trying to be a better person. I've had experiences through my life that you would call mystical, experiences of energy and awareness that are beyond what we normally call normal experience. I don't identify with faith, though, so I don't really understand your question.

Phillips: In *Loose Change*, you wrote about covering the feminist movement and then you come home and wonder why you're cooking and doing the dishes.¹⁷ There were other moments like that, where you would go out and cover people who believed intensely in what they were doing and were passionate about what they were doing. Then there would be some sign of how you were either thinking about things in a new way or being influenced or reflecting on yourself and the way your life was in a new way. That's what I mean by the tension between covering something and being influenced by it.

Davidson: As a human, how would I not be influenced? When you meet somebody who's passionate about something, or has a deep experience, in my case, you're either going to wish you had that experience, because it sounds wonderful, or you're going to say, "That's not for me, I can't go there." There

are a lot of times when I couldn't go there. But I'm always longing for greater awareness, to be a better person, to learn about truth. There is no absolute truth, but you want to get closer to what feels like reality, the real truth.

Phillips: What are the challenges of covering people with deep convictions?

Davidson: I get in trouble. I wrote the first piece I did on women's liberation for *Life* magazine,¹⁸ which is the most establishment of all the establishment magazines. At this time, I was married to a well-known disc jockey and writer.¹⁹ When he [Jonathan Schwartz] was a bachelor, he did everything for himself. But the minute we got married, he did nothing. I did it all, because I thought that's what you were supposed to do. Then I do the article on women's liberation, about a group in the Boston area that was learning martial arts for self-defense. They were throwing each other and breaking boards. There was a lot of tension between them and me, because they said, "You're coming from an establishment magazine. You are our enemy. How do we know we can trust you?" It was very dicey. They sort of let me be there, but they didn't like me. At one point, the instructor yelled "bricks!" I was sitting on the side, and they all turned toward me and ran towards me. I thought they were going to pull me apart. But I was sitting right by a stack of bricks, and that's what they were after. They each took a brick and began pounding it with their fists.

Right before I went back to New York to write the piece, they said to me, "You're going to let us review this, right?" I said, "No." Then this whole argument began that I was working for the bourgeois capitalist press, and I was capitalizing on them for my own career advancement. If I really believed in the movement, I would show them the article and allow them to make requests for changes. I said, "That's just not how journalism works. That's not what I was taught at Columbia, that you submit your work to the person you've written about and let them make changes. That's PR. It's not journalism." They were shocked and offended. Basically, I came home, and I was a mess. I cried. It was just awful, to be attacked by all these people, some of them friends of mine from when I lived in Cambridge and worked for the *Boston Globe*. They all turned against me and called me names. They said I was using them for my own career advancement. That was true at a certain level. But I was doing my job. I knew that the role of the journalist was to tell the truth as best you could. You could not get the approval of your subjects so you could be writing something that they would be pleased with. More often than not, people were not pleased with what I wrote.

When I wrote about communes for *Harper's*,²⁰ I stayed in the shack that was built by the leader of the commune. He and his wife were living there with their two children, two young boys. They didn't believe in diapers. So

the kids were just wandering around, peeing on the floor whenever, and the whole house smelled of pee. It was hard to be there. I had to breathe through my mouth. I wrote in the article that they didn't believe in diapers. I said the house smelled faintly of urine, which was an understatement. Well, the wife hitchhiked across the country, found my number, called me, and said, "You wrote that my house smelled of pee, in a magazine that everybody's reading. You absolutely mortified me. I can't even show my face among my friends." I said, "Well, I'm glad you had a chance to tell me that." And she said, "Yeah, feels really good. You were a piece of shit." You know, this was the kind of reaction I was getting, and it would destroy me. There was another time when I was on a team of *Boston Globe* journalists covering the Republican convention when Nixon was nominated. I came up with the idea of following a delegate from the Boston area from the moment he [got off] the plane until the time he went back to Boston. I was with him the whole time. I wrote the story, which included descriptions of his drinking scotch and waterskiing. I was shunned by the rest of the reporters from the *Globe*. One of them said, "He's going to lose his job. His wife's going to divorce him. You just ruined that man's life." I said, "What? Because I wrote that he drank a lot of scotch, and we went waterskiing with people? I just told what happened." He said, "You don't do that." There was this agreement between the political journalists and the politicians. You've probably heard that they never wrote about all of John F. Kennedy's hanky-panky. It was just a code. You were friends, and there were certain places you didn't go.

I would go out and do the job and not hold anything back, and then I'd come home and be assaulted and be devastated and depressed and hurt. You develop a relationship when you interview someone. Already I can feel a certain relationship with you. I see who you are, I can sense how your mind works, and you're getting a sense of me. There's a relationship here now that there wasn't before. The more the journalist cultivates the relationship, the more they let down their guard. It's Joan Didion's famous line: "*writers are always selling somebody out.*"²¹ She spent thirty years explaining what she meant. What she meant is people don't see themselves the way somebody else does. If you truthfully say what you saw, you're going to hurt some feelings. Tom Wolfe said that "you have to believe that what you're doing is more important than . . . anything else."²² He meant that you have no obligations except to the truth as you see it. That was helpful. You know, I understood, but it would still hurt. I like to say that I lost at least one friend with every book I wrote. It didn't happen with *The December Project*, my book about Reb Zalman, and I don't think it happened with the book before that [*Joan: Forty Years of Life, Loss, and Friendship with Joan Didion*].

Phillips: You've talked a lot about how Didion has influenced you and mentored you. Do you think that you have influenced her?

Davidson: No, no. That'd be a big thing for someone to say. I mean, she's Joan Didion.

Phillips: What else should we know about your time in the New Journalism era?

Davidson: It was both exciting and terrifying to be a journalist in the '60s and '70s in New York. Suddenly the spotlight was on what we were doing. It was exciting because we were breaking new ground, and we all read and admired and helped each other. It was terrifying because I didn't have confidence that I could do it again and again. When you begin as a writer, at least for me, every time I had a new assignment, I was terrified I couldn't pull it off. I was tied up in knots. If you saw me when I was at my desk, I looked like I was in terrible pain, trying to pull out a transition and figure out where things would go. Now I know that once it's on paper, I can fix whatever the problem is, however bad it is, and the first drafts can be awful. But I didn't know that when I started out. What I always try to tell young journalists and young writers is to get it on the page. No matter how bad it is, just get it on the page. Because unlike an artist who has paint or clay or wood to work with, or musicians who have a scale and notes and sounds, you have nothing until you have put your words on a page. Just get out everything you think you want to say or talk about. Editing is the part I really enjoy. I used to hate it. But now I just love it. To me that is the real fun, when you really get to play, and you know you're making it better and better and better and better. One of the questions I asked Joan Didion was, "Do you always go through that fear?" She said, every time; it doesn't get easier. In my case it took twenty years, thirty years, for the terror of writing to leave. I wish I had gained that confidence and assurance much earlier, but I guess you have to go through what you do.

Lisa A. Phillips, an associate professor of journalism and chair of the Digital Media and Journalism department at SUNY New Paltz, is the author of Unrequited: Women and Romantic Obsession and Public Radio: Behind the Voices.



Notes

- ¹ Davidson, *Loose Change*.
- ² Popularly known as the *Daily Cal*, the *Daily Californian* is the “independent student newspaper and the paper of record for the city of Berkeley, California.” Accessed July 7, 2021. <https://www.dailycal.org/>.
- ³ Davidson, *Real Property*.
- ⁴ Sims, “Sara Davidson,” and Davidson, “Real Property,” in Sims, *The Literary Journalists*, 187, 188–212.
- ⁵ Davidson, *The December Project*.
- ⁶ Davidson, *Joan: Forty Years of Life*.
- ⁷ Sullivan, *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman*.
- ⁸ Davidson, “Rock Style,” 53–62.
- ⁹ Davidson, “Jacqueline Susann,” 65–71.
- ¹⁰ Davidson, *Harper’s*, 65. See also, Davidson, “Jacqueline Susann,” in *Real Property*, 99.
- ¹¹ Davidson, *Cowboy*.
- ¹² Capote, “The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel,” BR2.
- ¹³ Weingarten, *The Gang That Wouldn’t Write Straight*.
- ¹⁴ See Trachtenberg, “Nora Ephron on Writing, Cooking and Aging, Gracefully or Not”; and Hanks, “Tom Hanks Considers the Cosmos,” interview by Linda Holmes.
- ¹⁵ Wolfe, “The Birth of ‘the New Journalism,’” 1, 30–38, 43–45.
- ¹⁶ Davidson, “Foremothers,” 71f.
- ¹⁷ Davidson, *Loose Change*, 168.
- ¹⁸ Davidson, “An ‘Oppressed Majority’ Demands Its Rights,” 66–78.
- ¹⁹ Elsewhere, Davidson has discussed her marriage to Jonathan Schwartz, a New York radio host. See Warrick, “Love on the Range.”
- ²⁰ Davidson, “Open Land.” 1–11.
- ²¹ Didion, *Slouching toward Bethlehem*, xiv (emphasis in the original).
- ²² See Wolfe, “Interview with Tom Wolfe,” para. 4.

Bibliography

- Capote, Truman. “The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel.” Interview by George Plimpton. *New York Times*, January 16, 1966, BR2.
- Davidson, Sara. *Cowboy: A Love Story*. New York: Cliff Street Books, 1999.
- . *The December Project: An Extraordinary Rabbi and a Skeptical Seeker Confront Life’s Greatest Mystery*. New York: HarperCollins, 2014.
- . “Foremothers.” *Esquire*, July 1973, 71f.
- . “Jacqueline Susann: The Writing Machine.” *Harper’s*, October 1969, 65–71. <https://harpers.org/archive/1960/10/jacqueline-susann/>.
- . *Joan: Forty Years of Life, Loss, and Friendship with Joan Didion*. Byliner, 2011.
- . *Loose Change: Three Women of the Sixties*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997. First published 1977 by Doubleday (Garden City, NY).

- . “Open Land: Getting Back to the Communal Garden.” *Harper’s*, June 1970, 240. <https://harpers.org/archive/1970/06/open-land/>.
- . “An ‘Oppressed Majority’ Demands Its Rights.” *Life*, December 12, 1969, 66–78. https://books.google.com/books?id=yFAEAAAAMBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false. Table of contents gives title as “Militants for Women’s Rights,” 66D.
- . *Real Property*. Pocket Books, 1981. First published 1980 by Doubleday (Garden City, NY). See esp. “Real Property” and “Jacqueline Susann.”
- . “Rock Style: Defying the American Dream.” *Harper’s*, July 1969, 53–62. <https://harpers.org/archive/1969/07/rock-style/>.
- Didion, Joan. *Slouching toward Bethlehem: Essays*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008. First published 1968 by Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Hanks, Tom. “Tom Hanks Considers the Cosmos, Nora Ephron, and a Man Dressed as a Shrimp.” Interview by Linda Holmes. *NPR*, October 19, 2017. <https://www.npr.org/2017/10/19/558292356/tom-hanks-considers-the-cosmos-nora-ephron-and-a-man-dressed-as-a-shrimp>.
- Sims, Norman, ed. *The Literary Journalists*. New York: Ballantine, 1984. See esp. “Sara Davidson” and “Real Property.”
- Sullivan, Beth, Timothy Johnson, Carl Binder, Josef Anderson, Philip Gerson, Arthur Seidel, Sara Davidson, et al. *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman*. A & E Home Video, 2009.
- Trachtenberg, Jeffrey A. “Nora Ephron on Writing, Cooking and Aging, Gracefully or Not.” *Wall Street Journal*, August 19, 2006. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB115583387816438444>.
- Warrick, Pamela. “Love on the Range.” *Los Angeles Times*, March 22, 1966. <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1999-mar-22-cl-19667-story.html>.
- Weingarten, Marc, *The Gang That Wouldn’t Write Straight: Wolfe, Thompson, Didion, and the New Journalism Revolution*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2006.
- Wolfe, Tom. “The Birth of ‘the New Journalism’: Eyewitness Report by Tom Wolfe.” *New York*, February 14, 1972, 1, 30–38, 43–45.
- . “Interview with Tom Wolfe.” By Anonymous Interviewer. Chicago Public Library, October 31, 2008. <https://www.chipublib.org/interview-with-tom-wolfe/>.