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ABSTRACT

PULP LITERATURE: A RE-EVALUATION

The purpose of this dissertation is to redress the literary academy’s view of Pulp Literature as an inconsequential form, which does not merit serious contemplation, or artistic recognition. Although it is true that recent literary criticism has attempted to elevate the importance of Pulp by positing it as the natural postmodern “other” to ‘high’ literature, the thesis demonstrates how this dichotomy has proven to be counter-productive to its aim. That is, although this theoretical approach does invite legitimate investigation of the form, many academics simply use this technique to reinforce their claims for the superiority of so-called ‘canonic’ texts. Therefore, rather than continuing along this downward path, this thesis focuses more on the subversive machinations of Pulp Literature as a social, economic, political, and theoretical force with its own strategies and agendas, opening with an investigation of the history of Pulp Literature as a cultural form. I argue that, from its very conception with the invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century, Pulp has always offered a radical alternative to the mainstream by providing a voice for the marginalised and the oppressed in the societies of the world. The thesis traces this political role as the aesthetic evolves into the new forms and technologies of a contemporary culture, where many academics still refuse to acknowledge Pulp as an important agent for the transmission of ideological views, and an impetus to instigate social change.
The concluding arguments move away from the quantitative, to the more theoretically evaluative section of the thesis. This consists of a discussion of the conceptual boundaries surrounding the aesthetic of Pulp, broaching such subjects as literary evaluation, canonicity, and canon formation. This debate ultimately revolves around the question, ‘if literary theorists cannot ‘objectively’ determine what literary ‘quality’ is, then how can we hope to define Pulp?’

In an attempt to answer this question, the thesis juxtaposes the criteria of a number of literary theorists from this field of inquiry, namely, Thomas R. Whissen, Clive Bloom, Thomas J. Roberts, Harold Bloom, Andrew Calcutt and Richard Shephard, to formulate an aesthetic that is not only markedly different to their’s, but more significantly, one which situates Pulp Literature at the head of the literary academic table.
PULP LITERATURE: A RE-EVALUATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS x

INTRODUCTION

What is Pulp Literature? & Why Do They Say Such Terrible Things About it?

What is Pulp Literature? xii

And Why Does Pulp Need to be Re-evaluated? xvi

Water, Water, Everywhere – But Not a Drop to Drink! (a Disclaimer) xix

CHAPTER 1.

Dear Sir, or Madam Will You Read My Book?: The History of the Thesis

What is in a Title?: The Problematics of Researching Pulp 2

Searching for the New Soul Rebels: A Short Survey of Pulp 5

General Cultural Theorists and Historians 6

Primary Cultural Theorists and Historians 9
A List for Life: What I Have Read. And What I Must Leave Out 13
Plan 9 from Outer Space: The Structure of the Thesis 17

CHAPTER 2.
Pulp from the Cave to the Industrial Revolution
A Pulp Perspective of the Past 25
The Invention of the Printing Press: Pulp Attitude, Broadsheets & Pamphlets 27
Newspapers 36
The First Pulplications: Chapbooks, Blue Books, Shilling Shockers, Penny Dreadfuls, The Short Story, & the Novel 41
The Slicks, Dime Novels & Magazines 49

CHAPTER 3.
The Death of Pulp
Henry Steeger (President of Popular Publications Inc) on the Death of the Pulp 62
Just the Facts, Ma’am: a Birth & a Death in 1959 63
The Pulps 68
Munsey’s Rivals 69
Pocket Books, or Paperbacks 81
CHAPTER 4.

A Post-Mortem for Pulp

Mickey Spillane: Architect of the Death of Pulp  95
Gold Medal Books  104
The Joy of Juvenile Delinquency  107
The Heyday of Pulp  109
Gotcha Covered  111
A Post-Mortem for Pulp Magazines  114
Viva Pulp Content!!  115
Beating the System  117
The Death of Pulp (Revisited)  125

CHAPTER 5.

Death was (not) THE END: The Ideology of Pulp

Pulp as Ideology: The Legacy of the Fifties  140
Dashiell Hammett & the Creation of Pulp’s Political Conscience  144
From the Pulp Culture of the Sixties, to 2001  157
For the Times They are A-Changin’  158
The Beats Become Hippies  161
The Failure of the Hippie Generation  164
CHAPTER 6.

Questions of Questionable Quality: The Problems of Evaluation

Questions of Questionable Quality

What is ‘Objective’ Aesthetic Taste?

What is ‘Subjective’ Aesthetic Taste?

Charles Bukowski Finds Gold at the City Dump

What is ‘Subjective’ Aesthetic Taste? (Revisited)

Can Too Many Books Spoil the Broth?

Alvin Toffler: The Transience of Books and Literature

Salman Rushdie: Odds of 4999:1, maybe?

Sir Walter Murdoch & the Queer Freaks of a Chaotic Time

Picking Eagles from Turkeys

CHAPTER 7.

Pulp versus the Western Canon

Sturgeon’s Law: 90% of Everything is Crap!

Pulp is not Junk: The Failure of Thomas J. Roberts’s Aesthetics for Junk Fiction

Pulp versus the Western Canon

Why Pulp is not Cult: Criticism of Thomas R. Whissen’s Cult Canon Formation

Criticism of Clive Bloom’s Poststructuralist Agenda for Pulp

A Last Word on the Implications of Pulp on the Western Canon
CONCLUSION

“Thank God for the Pulps!”

What did the Historical Overview Uncover? 275
What did the Evaluative Section Uncover? 277
Coda: “Thank God for the Pulps!” 281

BIBLIOGRAPHY 291

APPENDIX

Selected Highlights from a “List for Life” 299
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks must go to those people for whom this thesis would never have reached completion. A debt of gratitude is owed to my supervisor, Professor Horst Ruthrof, for his patience, enthusiasm, reassurance, and his foundational ‘grid’ which always insured that from the very beginning (even when I ran off the rails occasionally), that there was an end in sight.

Similarly, an enormous debt of gratitude is owed to my good friend Joe Marrable for his constantly engaging and insightful debate, his computer literacy, editing ability, and God-like prowess on the guitar.

My appreciation is also forwarded to Professor John Frodsham, whose advice at the start of my undergraduate career that “if I pulled my socks up, I might be quite good at this sort of thing”, proved to be the inspiration for my desire to attempt to do so. Therefore, his availability to assess the final proof of this thesis, carries an added significance.

Just as significantly, I would like to acknowledge the love and support of friends and family who have helped to keep me sane throughout the emotional highs and lows of this roller-coaster of a journey.
A world of gratitude is owed to my incredible wife Kathy and my sons Oliver, Zaine and Xavier for their inexhaustible patience, and for their contribution to making this such a pleasurable experience.

Special thanks for being there goes out to: Ian Morgan, Mark Russo, Geoff Bishop, Sue and Glenn Mallaby, and Steve Padley (who saved my technophobic neck on more than one occasion).