

ROUTLEDGE REVIVALS

Bestsellers

Popular Fiction of the 1970s

John Sutherland




Bestsellers

John Sutherland

Department of English, University of London

Bestsellers

Popular fiction of the 1970s



Routledge & Kegan Paul
London, Boston and Henley

*First published in 1981
by Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd
39 Store Street,
London WC1E 7DD,
9 Park Street,
Boston, Mass. 02108, USA, and
Broadway House,
Newtown Road,
Henley-on-Thames,
Oxon RG9 1BN*

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2010.

*To purchase your own copy of this or any of
Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks
please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.*

© John Sutherland 1981

*No part of this book may be reproduced in
any form without permission from the
publisher; except for the quotation of brief
passages in criticism*

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

*Sutherland, John Andrew
Bestsellers.
1. Bestsellers
I. Title
823.914 PR881 80-41390*

ISBN 0-203-83162-4 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-7100-0750-7 (Print Edition)

Mickey Spillane, one of the world's top mystery writers, is read in fourteen languages every minute of every day. Since *I, the Jury*, published in 1947, his books have sold more than 55,000,000 copies throughout the world. People like them.

(1970s blurb to Spillane's paperbacks. Spillane himself claims to have sold over 150,000,000 copies of his work.)

For some literary critics writing a book that is popular and commercially successful rates very high on the list of white-collar crime.

(Bestselling author Irwin Shaw reviewing superselling author Mario Puzo's *Fools Die*.)

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Preface	viii
Introduction	1
1 An American kind of book?	7
2 The bestseller machine and its diverse products	20
3 <i>The Godfather</i>	25
4 The novels of Arthur Hailey	31
5 Frighteners of the 1970s: <i>Children of the Dark</i>	38
6 Women's fiction I: <i>The Thorn Birds</i>	47
7 Women's fiction II: liberation and female masochism—Erica Jong and the 'bodice rippers'	52
8 <i>Star Wars</i>	56
9 Alistair MacLean and James Clavell	61
10 <i>Jaws</i>	70
11 Harold Robbins: the <i>roman à clef</i> I	78
12 The <i>roman à clef</i> II	83
13 Full disclosure: research and insider novels	88
14 <i>Death Wish</i> : from stetson to hard hat	99
15 The 'new western' and the middle-aged reader	105
16 Images of war I: secret histories	108
17 Images of war II: the nightmare that wouldn't die	116
18 Fashionable crime I: hijack	121
19 Fashionable crime II: embezzlement—the man with the briefcase	127
20 <i>QB VII</i> and the bestselling novel after Auschwitz	132
21 Nightmare and medicare: <i>Coma</i>	138
22 Documentary, superdocumentary and technology	144

vi *Contents*

23	Disaster	151
24	British pessimism: the ‘as if’ narratives	156
	Epilogue	160
	Checklist of fiction	162
	Bibliography of non-fiction	170
	Index	172

Acknowledgments

The author and publisher would like to thank the following for their kind permission to reprint copyright material:

George G.Harrap & Co, Unesco and Robert Escarpit for use of the table on p. 7; New English Library for the illustration on p. 128. Stephen Brook has been very helpful at every stage of writing. I am grateful to University College London for sabbatical leave, during which I had time to work on this project.

Preface

When I tell my colleagues that I am ‘working’ on bestsellers I have detected behind their polite interest the unstated question, ‘Why bother?’ Such scepticism, and even a mild rebuke, is understandable enough. Since one third of my salary as a university teacher is designed as a stipend for research, I (and my colleagues) can estimate that some £10,000 of UGC cash has gone into this exercise in reading less than good books. Most academic teachers of English become adept over the years at parrying the familiar accusation, ‘You lucky sods, you get *paid* for reading fun books. We have to do it in our own time after a *real* day’s work.’ (To which the standard reply is, ‘So you think reading the *Pisan Cantos* and *Finnegans Wake* is fun, do you?’) It is harder to parry when the literature in question is universally disdained by one’s own profession.

I don’t pretend to be adept in explaining it, but I have satisfied myself as to the value of spending my time and the state’s cash on ‘seriously’ reading the likes of Frederick Forsyth and Harold Robbins. As I have argued in a previous book, it seems evident to me that the literary or ‘quality’ novel is much more closely tied to the mass-consumption article (James’s ‘novel of commerce’) than our educational syllabus customarily allows. ‘Tied’ does not necessarily imply bondage. The thinking behind this study is not alarmist. I do not think the serious novel to be, as one slogan of 1975 put it, ‘an endangered species’—endangered, that is, by mass-produced *Trivialliteratur*. But I do think that the dominant mode of commercial production of fiction brings all sorts of formative and deforming pressures to bear on the best novels and novelists of our age. I would not go so far as to say that unless we understand *Jaws* we shall not fully understand Naipaul, but the fact that Benchley and Naipaul are both published (in Britain) by André Deutsch suggests, if not a congenital, at least a place-of-work relationship between bestseller and Booker Prize winner.

There is also, in my opinion, a usefully corrective aspect to the study of bestsellers. These novels deny us the luxury of clear cut, autonomous authorship and achieved ‘texts’. The lamentable decline of bibliography as a subject in recent years has confirmed among its students an attitude to literature which is both mystical and lazy. Even undergraduates now seem to assume that books are produced magically, effortlessly wished into existence by their artistically independent authors. One of the useful aspects of bestsellers is that we cannot see them as isolated texts with single minds behind them. We have to see them as books: things which are made and are successful in so far as they sell, not just things which are composed and are successful in so far as they are critically evaluated. Nor are bestsellers entirely made by their ‘authors’; a whole string of agents, editors and salesmen could—if copyright law and literary convention allowed—claim ‘credits’ in an essentially corporate venture.

Wherever possible I have used blurbs and publishers' synopses—not just out of idleness (though they are very convenient) but because such material bears an impress from the producers of the commodity and is thus often doubly demonstrative.

Annotation

A Checklist of the fiction works mentioned in the text will be found appended, with author and date of first publication. Since different forms and places of publication are involved I have not attempted to give the various British and American publishers. An exception is made where I have quoted. In such cases the edition used is indicated parenthetically after the Checklist entry. For non-fiction I have used the Harvard system of notation. Full details will be found in the Bibliography of non-fiction works appended.

Introduction

What, Henry James asked in 1899, would the novel of the twentieth century be like? That there would be a future for the form he was certain: 'till the world is an unpeopled void,' he prophesied, 'there will be an image in the mirror.' But the quality of that image, the 'art' which he had laboured to raise, James saw as threatened by fiction's spectacular success as a market commodity. There had been 'monstrous multiplications':

The published statistics are extraordinary, and of a sort to engender many kinds of uneasiness. The sort of taste that used to be called 'good' has nothing to do with the matter: we are so demonstrably in presence of millions for whom taste is but an obscure, confused, immediate instinct. In the flare of railway bookstalls, in the shop-fronts of most booksellers, especially the provincial, in the advertisements of the weekly newspapers, and in fifty places besides, this testimony to the general preference triumphs (James, 1962, pp. 48–9).

The great novelist's overture to the new century finishes on an uplifting note. But the essay as a whole is haunted by James's 'uneasiness' at the perceived 'triumph' of the 'general preference' of the 'millions'. Trampling through the neat parterres of the House of Fiction is Demos, emancipated by the Common Schools Act of 1870 and sodden with an excess of those low novels that George Eliot memorably called 'spiritual gin'. The Hogarthian allusion is not quite right, however, for it was the newness and, in an obscure way, the new technology which alarmed the nineteenth-century clerisy. Matthew Arnold, for example, picked on the same associations of 'flaring' gaslight and steam engines in his description of 'the tawdry novels which flare in the bookshelves of our railway stations, and which seem designed, as so much else that is produced for the use of our middle class seems designed, for people with a low standard of life' (Williams, 1961, p. 169).

It was a couple of years before James wrote 'The future of the novel', but it was in his other home, America, that the term 'bestseller' originated. And clearly enough it is the now familiar glossy bestseller and bestsellerdom that he foresaw. It is noteworthy, however, that although it alarmed him as a portent, James—who almost single-handedly made his kind of fiction *discutable*—does not discuss the 'English novel of commerce'. To do so is 'impossible, I think...without bringing into the field many illustrations drawn from individuals—without pointing the moral with names both conspicuous and obscure. Such a freedom would carry us, here, quite too far, and would moreover only encumber the path' (James, 1962, p. 54). The task is declined by James, not only 'here' but elsewhere. The taste of the millions in novels—their fiction factory, to adapt the Jamesian metaphor—is glimpsed only fleetingly in stall displays, through shop windows and in advertisements.

The majority of critics of the twentieth century follow James's practice. Anthony Burgess, for example, writing a study comprehensively entitled *The Novel Now* ('now' being 1945–71) confidently discards much of what is, ostensibly, his subject matter:

2 *Bestsellers: Popular fiction of the 1970s*

Very occasionally the best book and the bestseller coincide, but generally the books that make the most money are those which lack both style and subtlety and present a grossly over-simplified picture of life. Such books are poor art, and life is too short to bother with any art that is not the best of its kind (Burgess, 1971, p. 20).

Embodied in this bluff dismissal notice served on a large slice of Anglo-American fiction are a familiar set of interlocking prejudices, all confirming Burgess's critical triage. First, there is the *prédilection d'artiste* for the 'aristocratic', the stronger since Burgess, like Lawrence who elaborated the theory, is a major novelist ('style and subtlety' opposed to 'poor art'—the class attributes transpose clearly enough). This hauteur is buttressed by an appeal to the select canon of 'real' and 'classic' art which transcends the flux of time; of the many maxims he could have chosen, Burgess chooses to cue us with Hippocrates' *ars longa, vita brevis* ('life is too short to bother...'). Finally, underpinning the whole is Arnold's notion of the 'culture' of the highly educated minority, 'the best that has been thought and said' (Burgess's gloss: 'the best of its kind'). The bestness which is not respected is that of selling.

Burgess's is one book, and within its self-imposed restriction a good one. But around us, every week, we see the same prejudice at work. An alien, with nothing but the back ends of our weeklies or the Friday and Sunday supplements to go on, would hardly infer that the fiction industry depends preponderantly on a handful of current bestsellers and a mass of genre productions, largely brought out in paperback (a form generally ignored by reviewers, though for twenty years the majority of novels have been bought as reprints in soft covers). This flattering misapprehension of a reading public abuzz with interest in the week's 'quality' hardback novels is quickly dispelled by a visit to any of W.H.Smith's eighty or so station bookshops. In their 'flare' (brighter even than that which appalled James and Arnold) one is bombarded by 'W.H.SMITH'S TOP TEN PAPERBACKS' (predominantly fiction), a 'bestsellers' section (paperback novels) and rank upon rank of sf (science fiction), gothic, thriller and romance volumes—all paperback. What one does not find are the £5 apiece novels earnestly evaluated in this week's *New Statesman*, *Spectator* or *TLS*.

One can cite other examples of the bestseller's invisibility at the level where literature is seriously discussed. In 1976 a comprehensive guide to British and American *Contemporary Novelists* was prepared by St James Press, London, and St Martin's Press, New York. It is a massive volume, more like a building block than a book. Some 1,650 pages long, it represents the efforts of two Editors, twenty-nine Advisers (all distinguished academics or otherwise literary dignitaries) and 194 Contributors. Between them this critical regiment have produced entries on nearly 700 novelists, arranged alphabetically from Ahmad Abbas to Sol Yurick. The comprehensiveness of the work is astonishing; everyone will find authors whom he has never heard of, but whose contribution to contemporary fiction is clearly substantial. And equally astonishing is the cyclopaedia's omission of novelists one cannot but have heard of, but whom the Advisers regard as beneath notice. Even a reference work of this extensiveness can find no room for Harold Robbins (with an estimated 200 m. sales), Alistair MacLean (with an estimated 150 m. sales), Frederick Forsyth (with an estimated

50 m. sales), Mickey Spillane (with an estimated 150 m. sales), Barbara Cartland (with an estimated 100 m. sales), Jacqueline Susann (whose bestselling novel has sold over 6 m. in the US) or Peter Benchley (whose bestselling novel has sold over 10 m. in the US).

There are good reasons for this quite typical neglect. Academic and higher-journalism approaches habitually establish a critic/subject to literary/object relationship, which the bestseller slips out of. The bestseller is never static or sufficiently complete in itself for criticism either to get to work on it, or to make the work worthwhile. (Thinking along these lines Colin Watson observes, in his entertaining *Snobbery With Violence*, that looking for literary qualities in Edgar Wallace is as futile as applying canons of sculpture to a pile of gravel.) We have no critical vocabulary for applauding the ingenious, polymorphic tie-ins of an otherwise poor novel (its media adaptability), or for congratulating a novelist who writes indifferently—or even appallingly—but promotes his or her book with genius (Jacqueline Susann is a prime example). Above all, criticism has great difficulty in coming to terms with the ephemeral product; there is no good criticism of the bestseller for the same reason that there is no good criticism of television; the thing is never around long enough to be engaged with. Denied his customary durable object, the reviewer/critic falls back on a kind of Podsnappery ('Not literature!') and saves his time for more worthwhile activities. Bestsellers are left to the mock-critical assessments of the advertising man.

Traditionally, then, 'bestseller' is not a term which has figured much in literary-critical discussion, other than as a pejorative for an outlying area of books which literary criticism prefers not to discuss. Yet, for some purposes, the utility of bestsellers lies in the very fact that they often have no literary merit to distract us. We are not therefore detained by any respect for their sanctity as 'texts'. Nor are we automatically led to think of them as finished products in their own right; instead we can view them as integrated and dependent parts of a frankly commercial machinery, itself the product of a particular society at a particular period of history. Seen in this way, the bestselling novel may be reckoned as subordinate to other parts of the manufacturing and consuming system—such as the publicity which helps sell it, the author's 'image' or the public's 'needs'. One is rarely tempted to detach the bestseller from the specific conditions of its typically brief bestselling existence. And what is useful about such culturally embedded works is what they tell us about the book trade, the market place, the reading public and society generally at the time they have done well. As a German critic neatly puts it: 'the bestseller indicates a successful sociological experiment' (Peters, 1976, p. 139). There is a hand-in-glove relationship between the bestseller, its time and its productive apparatus. Withdrawn from this relationship they perplex us: why, one wonders, should close on two million otherwise sensible Americans in 1972 have wanted to buy *Jonathan Livingston Seagull*? Answers can only be found by looking at the historical and book trade circumstances in which Bach's book 'made it'. In this way the bestseller forces us to think, as Raymond Williams, for example, would have us always think, of 'Literature in Society' rather than 'Literature and Society' (Williams, 1977, p. 24). There are other reasons for reading bestsellers—not least that they are often fun to read. But it is the inextricability of bestsellers from their host culture and productive machinery that directs the attempt to read them critically in the following pages.

On the use of the term


The word 'bestseller' and its derivatives (bestsellerism, bestsellerdom) are not governed by any agreed definitions. In the book trade the many usages are casual, and often abused by the advertising industry's version of poetic licence and suggestive indefiniteness. 'Bestseller' can refer to books, a style of books or an author of books (Sidney Sheldon, for example, is proclaimed as 'Mr Bestseller'). One regularly encounters such illogicalities as still unpublished (and therefore entirely unsold) novels being described as 'surefire bestsellers'. And indeed, so many works in the course of a year are put forward as *bestsellers* as to make the superlative meaningless. (Once achieved, of course, the true bestseller would mean the end of bestsellerdom.)

Commentators on bestsellers have adopted various definitions of convenience. Simplest is Alice P.Hackett's taxonomic approach, in her various books on the American bestseller. For these surveys Hackett merely summarizes the works which have figured in the New York lists and makes up an annual 'ten bestsellers of the year' (fiction and non-fiction) aggregate. For Hackett, bestsellers are books which have had the honour of appearing in American bestseller lists. Slightly more analytic is F.L.Mott, in his 1947 study *Golden Multitudes*. Mott employs a quantitative threshold to identify the books which are his subject. His test for bestselling status is that a book shall sell a quantity equal to 1 per cent of the population of the US for the decade in which it was published. The advantage of Mott's calculus is that he can include in his discussion long-term steady-sellers which move too slowly to figure on weekly, monthly and annual lists, or which are too unglamorous to be included, since the essence of bestsellerism, as with pop music, is that there should be hectic change and turnover. The disadvantage of Mott's approach is that for him the bestseller is not a distinct genus but an ordinary book which succeeds to an extraordinary degree. Whereas for the book trade, of course, the bestseller stands in the same relation to other books as does a star to a supporting player. It is importantly *different* from the run of merchandise.

Robert Escarpit, in his works on the sociology of literature, confronts this question of how the successful book is different in kind, not just degree. For him the bestseller is typified by a distinctive selling curve; and the graphs which he sets up record not just a volume (which is what Mott does) but pace of sale (which Mott doesn't). Using this bi-axial measurement Escarpit discriminates between three forms of sales success: fastseller, steadyseller and bestseller (see table).

For Escarpit the bestseller is one of a very small number of books (some 2–3 per cent, as he reckons) which combine characteristics of the other two kinds of successful book: 'a best-seller is in fact a fast-seller which, at a certain point, develops into a steady-seller' (Escarpit, 1966, p. 118).

Escarpit's definition is precise and satisfyingly technical. Its disadvantage is, it seems to me, that it does not always do justice to the bestseller as 'an American kind of book'. Nor does Escarpit's method allow him to deal easily with the bestselling *author* (for example, Barbara Cartland, who has sold over 100 m. copies of her romances, yet rarely if ever has any single title on a list at any particular time) or *genre*, that is to say the bestselling line of books ('romance', 'gothics' etc.).



Source: Escarpit, 1966, p. 117.

Escarpit's work, as befits a literary sociologist, is admirably neutral and untainted by personal preference. In its neutrality it stands in flat contrast to a group of what might be called the morally indignant critics of bestsellers, of whom the best known are probably O.H.Cheney (*Economic Survey of the Book Industry*, 1932), Q.D.Leavis (*Fiction and the Reading Public*, 1932), and, most recently, Per Gedin (*Literature in the Market Place*, 1977). For these commentators the bestseller is, primarily, the product of a debased cultural ethos—bestsellerdom. Their studies, all of them highly eloquent, are suffused with pessimism, or at best a depressed sense that whatever hope there is lies in the resistant power of 'an armed and conscious minority'. The bestseller is conceived by this kind of critic to signal literature's surrender to the machinery of advanced capitalism. As a cultural system bestsellerdom is marked by an internal drive towards total commercial rationalization. So driven, it is portentous and symptomatic of general malaise (it is to make these larger points that Richard Hoggart, for instance, introduces a survey of popular literature in his *The Uses of Literacy*, 1957). In the discussions of these influential critics 'bestseller' is invariably a pejorative.

My own use of the term is, I hope, neutral and nonpejorative. As will be evident from the following chapters, I would contend that bestsellers are usefully approached

6 *Bestsellers: Popular fiction of the 1970s*

by an examination of the apparatus which produces them (bestseller lists, the publishing industry, publicity), an apparatus which is called here, for convenience, 'bestsellerism'. In the following pages I do not make Escarpit's fine distinction between 'fastsellers' and 'bestsellers'. Nor, of course, do the American and British book trades. For me (and them) the contemporary fiction bestseller is, more often than not, a fastselling book which never achieves the respectable middleage of steady demand. And the main form in which this fastseller/bestseller retails is now the paperback. (Arguably in the UK, where titles get on what bestseller lists there are with sales of 20,000 or less, there is no such thing as a 'hardback bestseller'.)

In the 1970s the production of paperback bestsellers has rationalized around two poles: that of the blockbuster (whose sales, in the US alone, can achieve 10 m. in a couple of years) and genre (one of the striking features of the period has been the growth of traditional genre lines, like sf, and the innovation of bestselling new lines such as the 'bodice ripper', or soft-porn historical romance designed for the women's market). In the main section of this study I have concentrated on the more spectacular blockbusters and supersellers of the 1970s, especially those which have benefited from being tied in to films and television.

Chapter One

An American kind of book?

To begin with the most obvious and important point: America is, in my experience, the only country in the world which is, for better and for worse, squarely, uncompromisingly in the twentieth century.

(A.Alvarez)

I

A vast number of new novels are published every year. Probably no ordinary reader gets through more than 1 per cent of the 2,000 or so new titles which are put out annually in the British and American markets. Even extraordinary readers—regular reviewers, for example—are unlikely to take in as much as 10 per cent of the whole. One year's wave washes over the last, and in a decade hosts of literary aspirations, small achievements and potboilers are irretrievably gone. Few categories of book can be less disturbed in the six copyright libraries than the unmemorable bulk of this century's 100,000 novels.

In the flux of new products which the book trade churns out, a minority of works achieve some more or less permanent existence and stay in view for longer than the moment granted to most novels. A very few—certainly less than one a year—enter the canon of literature, the hoped-for destiny of any self-respecting work. These touchstones will eventually be studied in schools and universities. Their author's working materials and literary remains will be sought out and carefully archived; for in all probability there will follow a biography, critical monographs, theses, scholarly editions and exegesis in learned journals. Lay readers will deferentially buy or borrow the endorsed 'classic', whose worth they largely take on trust. There are, in fact, few better preservatives of a novel and its author's fame than to be set for examination, to be judged as suitable research material by the committees which approve PhD topics, or to be approached by an American university offering the curatorship of manuscript materials.

Permanence of a less absolute kind is achieved by bestsellers. For a season, extending usually from a few weeks to a year, these novels withstand the forces which push most fiction into speedy oblivion. But even supersellers cannot reckon on staying in the lists for much more than a year, and most will do well to last a couple of months. And to gain this moderate lease of life a novel will have to sell enormously: between 100,000 and 800,000 in hardback, and between one and six millions in paperback (these American figures can be scaled down to about a fifth for the UK market).

Unlike the candidates for literary canonization, the number of bestsellers is quite predictable. From week to week there will be ten in the two main book forms. By the end of the year some forty new novels, and newly paperbacked novels, will have made the lists. Given this even-paced turnover, the superlative 'bestseller' is something of a confidence

trick. It should correctly be ‘better-than-average seller’ or ‘top-bracket seller’. But it is, of course, unthinkable that the book trade in the interest of semantic precision should ever sacrifice the salesworthy implication that the bestseller is *the* book of books. ‘Hype’ (trade lies) is the first language of bestsellerdom.

One of the most striking features of the bestseller, compared to the ‘literary’ novel, is the all-or-nothing nature of its achievement. It is commonly the book that everyone is reading now, or that no one is reading anymore. Once a bestseller is spent, or its formula is spent, no residue is left. This partly explains why popular fiction has no generic sense of sustained progress or tradition. It is always ‘new’ but never an advance; *Airport* ’75 is ahead of *Airport*, *Airport* ’79 ahead of *Airport* ’77, only in date. *Jaws 2* is a sequel, but in no sense an advance on *Jaws*. And no more than popular fiction is the bestselling author registered in the public mind as developing from novel to novel. He has no *oeuvre*, merely a rate of production and a brand-named, standardized product. The ‘latest Harold Robbins’ is a very different formulation from ‘Lawrence’s later novels’.

It is also, one might argue, a fundamentally un-English formulation, alien to cisatlantic cultural traditions and book trade customs. The OED gives an American origin for the term bestseller, an etymology which one instinctively feels to be right. The word still sounds American, like ‘movie star’, ‘hit parade’, or baseball’s ‘hall of fame’. It is, however, earlier in origin than these three coinages. The first recorded use of the term ‘bestseller’ is in the last decade of the nineteenth century, and we can trace the system (‘bestsellerism’) to preverbal origins in the practice of American publishing and bookselling before the Act of 1891 which enforced the observance of international copyright. As a business in the nineteenth century largely dependent on systematic piracy, the American book trade had much more interest in the sale of books than their origination. Until 1891 the raw material was always readily available to be stolen from (notably) British sources—how to merchandise it was the problem. Competitive price cutting, mail order, paperbound editions, high-pressure publicity, gimmickry, mass production economies of scale, sales in nonbookstore outlets were all force grown in the hot-house atmosphere of American book retailing. And so too was bestsellerism.

Historically, bestseller lists have been a part of American literary life since February 1895, when the *Bookman* began recording titles of novels ‘in the order of demand’ (piratical habits died hard; eight out of the ten novels listed were British). In 1897 this information was digested as ‘Best Selling Books’ and has been available to the American public ever since. (In 1912 *Publishers Weekly* extended coverage to non-fiction—but, true to its first formulation, the term bestseller still largely evokes the novel.) Various American journals and trade journals now not only list over-all country-wide successes from week to week, but also provide specialist lists for cities, regions, various categories of book and groups of readers. Thus, for example, it could be verified that the 1975 bestseller *Looking for Mr Goodbar* (the tragic story of a school teacher given to pick-ups in singles’ bars) headed lists in northern and southern California, New York and Boston—that is to say, areas where mores were relaxed and women’s liberation well organized. The feedback from bestseller lists concentrated publicity for the follow-up paperback where it would do most good. Campus bestseller lists inform the book trade how the student body, with its 20 per cent or so of the American book market, is behaving. Children’s books, religious books, cookery books, DIY books, all have their sales charted and provide simultaneous publicity and

market research. Every year since 1911, *Publishers Weekly* has had a special issue analyzing the leading sales of the past twelve months based on publishers' figures. And over the decades this information has been gathered by Alice P. Hackett into a series of regularly updated reports, of which the latest is entitled *80 Years of Bestsellers: 1895–1975*.

Anyone attempting Miss Hackett's comprehensive and numerically informative account for British bestsellers would face a Herculean task. There were no widely publicized or systematic lists in Britain until the *Sunday Times* began its weekly survey amid some controversy in the 1970s, decades after the *New York Times*. The *Bookseller* is similarly over half a century behind its opposite book trade organ in America, having begun its bestseller list only with the last change of editorship in the mid-1970s. The *Evening Standard* runs a modest paragraph at the foot of its Tuesday review page, indicating a few books doing well in London that week. It is based on telephone reports from six metropolitan bookshops. The recently introduced, and conservatively sub-titled, *Sunday Telegraph* 'Bestsellers in demand this month' is also based on information from six outlets, all older-fashioned, stockholding bookshops. The half-hearted conviction behind the *Sunday Telegraph* exercise is witnessed by the compromise of monthly rather than weekly reports and the fact that it gives five or six titles (not, apparently, in order) rather than the conventional 'top ten'. All of which seems very amateurish when the *New York Times* informs us that its hardback listings 'are based on computer-processed sales figures from 1,400 bookstores in every region of the US' and its mass-market paperback listings 'on computer processed reports from bookstores and representative wholesalers with more than 40,000 outlets across the US'. This extraordinarily conscientious census is clearly trusted by the American book trade and its public. Escalator clauses can be built into contracts with additional payments for every week a novel features in the *NYT* or other lists. And the *NYT* #1 symbol is a supreme award, and when earned is flaunted and prominently advertised. (It is, incidentally, quite meaningless to the British public, for whom it has to be glossed as 'number one international bestseller'—never, of course, 'number one bestseller in America', which would inflame a national inferiority complex.) As well as promoting individual titles for publishers, the bestsellers lists in America add sparkle to the bookclubs, which have in the past been much less reprint affairs than in the UK. The Literary Guild, for example, advertises itself as 'the Bestseller Bookclub' with huge double centre spreads in the *New York Times Book Review*, usually featuring the same titles that appear creditably in the journal's back-end bestseller lists.

The British book trade issues formidably precise statistical material when it wants to (witness the quarterly gross figures published in the *Bookseller*). British amateurishness, when it comes to recording what books are currently doing well, and just how well, goes with what seems to be a general lukewarmness about the value or decency of such exercises. (It is well known, for example, that the West End, unlike Broadway, does not publish box-office takings.) The British are not really sure they want that kind of thing—though American success with it constantly tempts them into thinking that it might be worth trying. The result is something that looks rather like timidity; a series of half-hearted and often abortive experiments. When the *Observer* began a list to rival the *Sunday Times* it was dropped after a short time. *Paperback and Popular Hardback Buyer*, which was launched in 1977 as a new-style trade journal (i.e. modelled on *Publishers Weekly* rather than the *Bookseller*) dropped its domestic bestseller charts in June 1979 (according to its editor, Brian Levy, he