

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

+ + + + +

## RADIO PRESERVATION TASK FORCE

+ + + + +

SAVING AMERICA'S RADIO HERITAGE:  
RADIO PRESERVATION, ACCESS, AND EDUCATION

+ + + + +

PANEL: BROADCASTING GENDER IN  
INTIMATE SETTINGS

+ + + + +

FRIDAY  
FEBRUARY 26, 2016

+ + + + +

The Panel met in the Library of Congress,  
Room 620, 101 Independence Avenue, Southeast,  
Washington, D.C., at 1:30 p.m., Mary Beth  
Haralovich, Panel Chair, presiding.

PANEL MEMBERS

MARY BETH HARALOVICH, Panel Chair, University of  
Arizona  
JENNIFER WANG, Independent Scholar  
JASON LOVIGLIO, University of Maryland,  
Baltimore County  
CATHERINE MARTIN, Boston University

RESPONDENT

BRENT MALIN, University of Pittsburgh

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:35 p.m.)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Okay, hi everybody. Welcome to our panel. We're going to get started while some technical difficulties get worked out. This panel is, "Broadcasting Gender in Intimate Settings." I am Mary Beth Haralovich, very happy to chair this panel.

And our first presenter will be Jennifer Wang. Who is an independent scholar researching gender in broadcast history, PhD from Wisconsin-Madison. Her dissertation describes the interaction of the daytime female audience with radio and early TV industries. And her work has been published in a number of journals. So, Jennifer.

MS. WANG: I'm going to start out without my PowerPoint because they're just up there working on it. So that's fine. I'll just jump on it.

(Off the record comments)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Okay, we need her mic on.

(Off the record comments)

MS. WANG: I think it's, how is that? No?

(Off the record comments)

MS. WANG: I was on. Yes, it's on. Better? Okay, all right. I'll speak louder.

So the title of my presentation is, "Did They Say What They Thought? Gender, Sound, and Oral History in Wisconsin Woman's Radio Programming."

In 1937 the Dane County Agent's Office, a government agency that coordinated agriculture extension efforts and the activities of rural organizations, created a weekly radio program called "The Dane County Farm Hour," on Madison's NCB affiliate WIBA to deliver news and information to the area farmers.

After a listener request for a woman's perspective on Dane County farm life, Assistant County Agent J. W. "Bill" Clark organized the, "We

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Say What We Think Club," 1937 to 1957. Clark invited five rural homemakers, active in a county-wide organization of women's clubs called the Dane County Rural Federation, to inaugurate the series on May 11th, 1937.

Intended as a six month, last-Wednesday of the month substitution for "The Dane County Farm Hour," the packed radio round table of Selma Sorenson, Sibylle Mitchell, Isabel Baumann, Grace Langer, and Ruth King, was broadcast for nearly 20 years.

What intrigued me about the program, beside its title, was its premise. The "We Say What We Think Clubs" adapted the informal social practices of middle class Dane County farm wives for radio, in creating an on-air club. Five folksy, middle-aged women weighed in each month on contemporary social and political issues.

PowerPoint's up. Thank you, thank you.  
Henry O! These are the ladies.

(Off the record comments)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MS. WANG: Where was I? So continuing, an on-air club, five, folksy, middle-aged women weighed in each month on contemporary social and political issues and subjects. Like the threat of marijuana to farm youth in 1937, [or] a local farm bill or if their daughters should indeed be encouraged to marry farmers.

The University Extension Specialist, professors and homemaking experts have often talked to rural women on the air. Rural women had rarely talked on air. So the informal style of "The We Say What We Think Club," gave the impression that these women were indeed saying what they thought on air.

However, on closer examination of the show's scripts, the conversation that appeared homey was actually meticulously crafted to appear spontaneous and natural by Assistant County Agent Clark, who'd insert notes like, "All talking together" and "Talking over others." Or my favorite stage direction, "Butting in," to produce

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the unrehearsed chatty broadcast that resembled coffee klatches more than debates.

Historical press reviews of the series reception, and the scripts, leave us with two opposing ways of understanding "The We Say What We Think Club." The extensively edited scripts demonstrate Clark's orchestration of the monthly radio roundtable.

Do these pencil marked scripts provide evidence of the control the members of the club had over its message? And what were the limits and opportunities for female speech over the radio in this local context?

There is little evidence to answer these questions definitively. Much of what is known about this radio program is found in the two boxes of papers and clippings donated to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

One of the central participants, Isabel Baumann, saved her copy of nearly every script broadcast over the course of 20 years. Without her,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

this local program would have been forgotten. Audio copies of this program do not exist and none of the other women of "The We Say What We Think Club" saved material from the show.

What little there is was discovered by accident when an oral historian named Dale Treleven stumbled upon Isabel Baumann's radio work and materials while interviewing her in 1980.

In the administrative papers of the Oral History Office he directed from 1974 to 1982, Treleven offers scholars insight into the institutional context that shaped his eight-hour interview with Isabel Baumann. This oral history is the only historical trace of her voice and how she made sense of her work in local radio.

My first section is oral history and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

Academic trends, historical events, and institutional shifts converged to bring "The We Say What We Think Club," to academic attention in 1980. First, historical traces of this radio program would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

never have been collected by an archive if it were not putting inauguration of the Oral History Office at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in 1974.

According to society lore, the process of gathering oral remembrances is as old as the society itself. Lyman C. Draper, seen here, is the first Superintendent of Wisconsin Historical Society. And he's considered by some to be the "Father of Oral History." He collected accounts of trans-Appalachian settlers and fur traders as early as the 1840's.

So that's designed to augment traditional yet increasingly illusive forms of historical documentation like letters and diaries in the post-War era. Oral histories became increasingly important to fill knowledge and interpretive gaps in the historical record.

Historians like Columbia's Allan Nevins transformed oral history into an important historical source in the mid-20th century.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

However, some historians still considered them suspect, unreliable, easily altered, and expensive to produce.

To allay these fears, oral history practitioners elevated practice into principle by carefully transcribing their interviews from notes, reel-to-reels, or audio cassettes to produce a written document, the gold standard of historical truth.

So once the transcript was complete and approved by the interviewee, it was routine practice to record over the interview and reuse the tape. Thus the type written transcript became the primary research document to be archived. And oral history practitioners were saddled with the often significant processing expenses.

Now the availability of affordable, portable tape recorders, a growing public interest in genealogy as popularized by Alex Haley's "Roots," and anticipation of bi-centennial celebrations drove the proliferation of oral history programs

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

across the country during the mid-70s.

In 1972, archivist William Moss observed, quote, "Something of a gold rush atmosphere" as amateurs, professionals rushed to record the stories of people marginalized in American society and omitted from American text books.

Oral history departments grew from approximately 400 in 1972 to more than 1,000 by 1978. So despite though, the growing acceptance of oral history as a legitimate historical source, historians and archivists continue to question the sustainability of these important efforts in the face of escalating transcription costs.

As the number of interviews grew, typical transcription costs of \$150 to \$200 dollars per interview hour overwhelmed the budgets of many state sponsored archives. The failure to reconcile this disparity, one academic observed, would be oral history's Waterloo.

In the mid to late 1970s, the State

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Historical Society of Wisconsin committed to this important work despite the considerable financial demands. On April 1st, 1974, Dale Treleven, an academic specializing in 20th century Midwest history, assumed the position of Oral History Coordinator.

Hewing closely to the society's mandate to document and preserve Wisconsin history, his first oral history project was to initiate a series of taped interviews with a wide range of individuals associated with Wisconsin agriculture, including those in academic departments, the years of farm organizations, conservationists, rural development experts, individual farmers, in various regions which culled innovators and non-innovators alike, journalists, civil servants, federal agencies, and migrant laborers.

For the eight years that the Oral History Department was funded, Treleven spoke to farmers about rural neighborhood activities, farming techniques, agricultural education, farm politics,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and farmer's organizations.

By 1980, Treleven had interviewed 150 people as part of the Wisconsin Agriculturalist Project, including notables like Percy Hardiman, the past president to the Wisconsin Farm Bureau.

Mindful of the importance of rural communities to the state economy, Treleven's academic focus supplemented existing agricultural collections of the society and encouraged in-state donors to contribute funds and materials about state agriculture and rural life to the society.

So, the financial constraints of state sponsored oral history motivated a unique archival innovation of the State Historical Society. Audio archivist George Talbot and Steven Masar and, later, Treleven, began testing an alternative to transcription in processing oral histories, adapting a system used for videotape by James Pilkington, of the Vanderbilt University Television News Archive.

Talbot and Masar attached an audio time

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

track to each processed audio cassette tape signaling the time at five second intervals with a detailed abstract. Linked to the audio track researchers would be able to find relevant material quickly and thus eliminate the need for verbatim transcription.

So this is a brief -- oh, no, that's Dale Treleven, there we go...

Brief aside, but I can't help but bringing some archival humor in. In some of the memos that he had, society archivists were debating a catchy acronym to reference their new archival system. So some suggested like MASAR, like Measured Access System. Some said TRELEVEN, though we don't know how seriously they took it. They also considered NOTRANSCRIPT, which stands for none of the Ritualistic, Anachronistic, Nevinized, Sanitized Crap in Our Processed Tapes. And my personal favorite, RATSASS -- Recording and Timing Synchronized Access System for Sound.

Disappointingly, they decided on TAPE,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

which was Timed Access to Pertinent Excerpts. TAPE, predicted Treleven in 1975, would ensure that, quote, "Thousands of dollars will be saved in processing costs and countless aspirins and swigs of Maalox will go unconsumed by the Oral History Coordinator."

His message that TAPE has reduced processing costs for audio taped interviews by 50 percent was repeated in academic articles and featured presentations at annual gatherings of the Oral History Association throughout the '70s.

The oral history community however did not immediately embrace this methodological breakthrough. Attempts to replace the transcript with an audio cassette were considered heretical, especially by the traditional well-financed programs at elite universities.

Treleven's response to this resistance was to argue that audio tapes must be preserved. We want, he said, to encourage researchers to listen to oral history interviews. Also of great

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

importance, we believe, because the tape holds the accurate record of the dynamic interplay between interviewer and interviewee, and of the environment in which the discussion occurred.

As more and more oral history programs adopted the system over the late '70s to reduce processing costs, a disciplinary shift occurred as Treleven recounted in a letter to another archivist, TAPE is a most ideal acronym serving to reinforce the system's fundamental premise that the sound recording, not a type written transcription thereof, is the definitive document of record.

Thus the system innovated at the Wisconsin Historical Society not only made state sponsored oral history viable, but effectively redefined the audio cassette as a primary research document. Because of the TAPE system, original cassettes were saved for replaying to later researchers and quote, "For the possibility that some new truth may be discovered from the oral original, not revealed by the typed script."

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Thus as part of the Wisconsin Agriculturalists Oral History Project, Dale Treleven contacted Isabel Baumann for an interview. As he reported in his field notes, it was primarily Baumann's participation in the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, and not her radio work, that brought her to his attention and favor in 1980.

He soon discovered that she would be an important source for the society, writing, quote, "In addition to her oral remembrances, Mrs. Baumann's heavy involvement in rural groups and activities over the past 50 years have made her an unusually valuable contact for identifying other knowledgeable rural women in Dane County. As well as for arranging for the donation of other types of historical material."

In April 1980, Treleven recorded eight hours of remembrances from Isabel Baumann. Her childhood, her time as a rural teacher, her experience as a farmer organization activist, and her career on local radio.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Indicative of Treleven's focus on Wisconsin agriculture, he devoted one tape out of the eight to her 20 year career on local radio. A few months after their interview, Baumann donated her scripts and notes from "The We Say What We Think Club," as well as documents about her decades-long service in local county and national farming organizations.

Treleven summed up her contribution as quote, "Hardly exciting stuff, but significant considering how little we have in our collections pertaining to Wisconsin rural women."

Of the more than 150 interviews about Wisconsin's rural life, Isabel Baumann was one of only a handful of women interviewed. And neither the state nor the society considered the stories of rural women to be a priority. The Oral History Office lost its state funding in 1982, eliminating any chance that other accounts of rural women might be preserved.

So, this is my last section, what the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

sounds of oral history can tell us about "The We Say What We Think Club"?

Oral history theorist Alessandro Portelli argues that oral histories are more than eyewitness accounts that are either true or false. That we must look for themes in the structures of the stories.

Considering this, Baumann's oral history sheds important light on "The We Say What We Think Club." One theme repeated over and over in these tapes is Baumann's belief in the saving power of community in rural life -- "It's been one of my feelings all my life that people can't go it alone," declared Baumann.

And when she speaks about the program's roundtable format, or the time spent at women's clubs, she marvels at how being community minded led to female empowerment.

The Farm Bureau and the Rural Federation, Baumann remarked, quote, "Helped women get into a position where they could express

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

themselves and do things on their own, you know. So many times, so many organizations always felt that the only things women could do was to make the cookies and the coffee. Farm Bureau emphasized over and over again, women are equal partners."

Bill Clark, she believed, was practically (she called him in the interview), quote, "The originator of the E-R-A, for encouraging rural club women to make radio."

She repeatedly inserted an entry that service to the rural community gained far more than power in rural life.

In fact, when we listen to Baumann discuss her radio show, we learn how she understands the show's production as a communal experience. Meeting one Sunday evening -- try to get my sound up there --

Meeting one Sunday evening a month, two weeks before their next broadcast, the five members of "The We Say What We Think Club," and the Dane County Agent, Bill Clark and his wife, Mary, would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

gather to enjoy a potluck dinner at one of the women's homes with husbands and families.

After dinner, the women and Clark would adjourn to another room to discuss that month's script while their husbands played six-handed euchre in another room. I told this story to some archivists, and they're like, "That's the most Wisconsin thing I've ever heard in my whole life." So they did this year-in and year-out for 20 years. Meeting for meals and spending evenings with each other. So I'm just going to give you a little taste of Isabel's voice and her discussion of what this group meant to her.

(Off the record comments)

MS. WANG: It is not there yet. Okay, so I'll tell you what she said -- which speaks her words. It is playing.

(Off the record comments)

MS. WANG: So play tape -- so this is what she says. I'll try to talk like her. She was 76 at the time:

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

"We became the closest of families. Grace Langer and John had no family. And Grace always said, she said, 'The We Say What We Think Club,' is my family.' This is just the way we felt about each other. We were so close.

"And we shared with Bill and Mary's excitement when Peter was born in 1940. They shared with our excitement when we adopted Duane in 1941. And then they shared my sorrow in 1942, when my husband died in a car accident. And then they shared in our happiness when August and I were married in 1947. And they were there. They were all there. They became our family."

The intimacy continued long after the program ended. Their annual tradition of gathering for a traditional Norwegian meal of lutefisk and lefse lasted until 1979. So the program ended '57, but - 1979, still meeting.

Her sadness is palpable as she remembers the women of "The We Say What We Think Club" all but one now deceased. Quote, "There were five

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

women, very different, very different, but five of one of the dearest friends as a women you could ever have."

Remembering their communal purpose and close family ties, Baumann conceptualized her 20 year career on local radio not only as a source of female empowerment, but also as a part of her service to rural communities.

So now Portelli reminds us that oral sources tell us not just what people did, but what they wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, and what they now think they did.

So the process of speaking about her life changed Baumann's understanding of her community work in the Farm Bureau, in rural women's organizations, and on radio.

And in a June 1980 memo, Treleven reported that Baumann quote, "Has spread far and wide," the pleasure of having her memoirs taped and the experience has forced her to not only review materials in her files, but also to think a good

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

deal about the significance of the groups with which she had been associated with over the past 50 years.

Throughout the interview, Baumann's awareness of the significance of her work on Dane County farm life and on radio grew. Reflecting on "The We Say What We Think Club," Baumann observed in the tapes, quote, "That was a crazy title, wasn't it? 'We Say What We Think Club,' but that's what we were doing. That's exactly what we were doing. Heck, that's what I'm doing now. Saying what I think."

Over two days and eight hours of interviews, Baumann put her life's work and her taped oral history into perspective. Quote, "As a result of my thinking about this, I wondered if we women ever half appreciated the contribution we had made to our communities?"

"I think there are many cases when you go along from day to day, to day, and you don't think about some of the things that women as a group can do and has done. This program has made me think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

about that.

"In fact, I found myself almost living in the past at times. I thoroughly enjoyed it, and I do think that the women of any local community in Wisconsin, and in any state, have made great contributions to their communities by the work they have done. And they have done it without people realizing they were doing it."

When she was interviewed later in 1989 as part of the Wisconsin Homemakers Extension Council, Baumann made even more of a claim about the significance of her radio work. She says, I quote, "I have often thought that it was the beginning of what we now know as talk programs. It would be nice if maybe Dane County homemakers today could get a group and do it again on TV."

And although her claim is broad, there's something admirable in her evaluation of the importance of her life's work, to improving rural life through radio.

So I end this paper with a call for us

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to collect as many voices as possible. To search for oral remembrances in addition to professional audio. Because local commercial media was not saved, we've lost the chance to hear countless marginalized women's voices.

Although the narrow agriculture focus, and the studies projects, privileged the voices of many farmers, over a few farm wives. Their focus, local history, or history in accordance of sound recordings, ensured the balanced story. And her voice should be preserved for future researchers.

As we all search for the sounds in radio's past in our research, through the Radio Preservation Task Force, you must remember to talk, to seek out the memories and perspectives from all who engage with these sounds. The person making radio, the oral historian who guides the interview, the archivist who catalogs it, or the researchers looking for it.

An oral history interview is about making meaning, suggests Mary Kay Quinlan. And all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

parties to the process including those who use interviews years after they were created, come with a personal perspective that will affect its meaning.

So while Dale Treleven is known for championing oral history as an innovative tape system, I appreciate him for the files he left behind. The administrative papers, the short-lived Oral History Office, that described how Isabel's story, a farm woman speaking to other farm women over the air, came to be.

And from these traces, we may not know how much of the scripts were dictated by the Dane County Agent's Office, and how much authority these club women had to shape their broadcast message. We may not know how the radio show impacted its real listeners. But the process of recording her life, and interacting with Dale Treleven, did encourage Baumann to claim her space in public life and in local history.

And as historians, we need to create spaces for women to say what they think, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

cultivate audiences ready to hear those stories.  
Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Thank you, Jennifer.  
Next up is Jason Loviglio, who is Associate  
Professor and Founding Chair of Media and  
Communication Studies at the University of  
Maryland, Baltimore County. He is the coauthor  
with Michele Hilmes of "Radio Reader" and "Radio's  
New Wave."

DR. LOVIGLIO: Thank you. Thank you so  
much, and thank you if you can make my sound work,  
that will be great, because I can't do the right  
accents for the media. Maybe Jen can help me?

(Off the record comments)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Yes, you be Judy.  
I'll be Jane.

I want to thank Jennifer Wang for  
organizing this session and for the other panelists,  
and the Chair, and our commentator for making this  
such an interesting group of papers. I'm looking

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

forward to hearing the discussion.

So my title should be, "Judy and Jane and the Archive, 1932 to 1947." So that's a change for the title. The Kluge Center at the Library of Congress, next door, is an odd place to find oneself immersed in this sudsy melodrama of daytime serial plotlines.

But there I was surrounded by bound scripts of "Judy and Jane" hoping that Jane's evil father-in-law and his sister wouldn't take her children away to live with them in their very creepy mansion with a serious "House of Usher" vibe.

The Kluge Center was built to resemble a ship, "To inspire scholars to travel the world of imagination," powered by the Library's massive holdings. Thanks to those holdings, I traveled to the 1930s, to the small fictional town of Honeycrest where Judy and Jane lived, worked, and struggled against a host of threats to their unorthodox family.

Briefly: "Judy and Jane" shared a home,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

which they called the "Little White House." Together, they ran the "Petticoat Party" which ruled the town of Honeycrest. Judy was the town's tax assessor, council member, and when necessary, a special sheriff tasked with busting up roadhouses.

They are surrounded by a community of outsiders, Italian immigrant farmers, merchant marines, working-class teens, and an idealistic Jewish immigrant filmmaker. They both fend off male suitors, citing each other as the reason why they could never get married.

And if you've not tired of loaded signs yet, Jane runs a shop called the Red Front, which she takes over and transforms from an upscale department store to a utopian market for the people, complete with vaudeville style entertainments and free sandwiches.

Reading these scripts in the Kluge Center was a strange odyssey. Bridging codes of high and low, masculine and feminine, straight and queer, mass culture and cultural fronts, paper

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

archives, and historical broadcast.

This last pair of opposites may be the most vexing for radio historians, confronted with scripts and other traces, but few extant recordings. This presentation focuses on the affordances and challenges of radio drama scripts for understanding their cultural import historically and in the contemporary context of their discovery. In the case of "Judy and Jane," I will explore how "reading" the program, as part of the radical cultural front of the 1930s, can be a very different thing than hearing it in that way.

This is made harder in the context of the dueling populisms of left and right that mark the popular and political discourses of the 1930s and the way they shifted with the U.S. entry into World War II in the 1940s.

In the case of "Judy and Jane," I will explore how reading the program as part of what Michael Denning called "The Cultural Front," can be a very different thing than hearing it that way.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And I'll briefly consider the difficulty of reading women's intimate friendships clearly from the distance of eight decades.

Reading radio scripts in the archives with such questions in mind more recently has put me in mind of Neil Verma's observation that some kinds of listening is hard for us to do long after the era in which a radio piece was first broadcast. The critical earspace, in James Lastra's term, is historically remote from us now. On the other hand, Verma adds, new kinds of listening are possible only now, with the passage of time and the opening of the vast affordances of the era of the digital archives which "allow[s] us to pause, rewind, categorize and remix vast amounts of golden age audio in a way that was impossible in 1947."

On the other hand, Verma reminds us, new kinds of listening are possible only now with the passage of time and the opening of vast affordances of the digital era which allow us, quote, "To pause, rewind, and to categorize, and re-mix vast amounts

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of Golden Age radio in a way that was impossible in 1947".

For Verma, the kaleidesonic fantasias of radio's poet laureate, Norman Corwin, are the occasion for this insight. Corwin's excesses may well have been heard as daring high wire acts rather than overwrought and over-written melodramas of beset, one-world liberalism.

I'd like to argue that the soap operas of the 1930s may well have been read from the critical earspace attuned to a different kind of risk: negotiating attention between emerging conventions of serial narratives, with their stuffy interiority and relentlessly domestic mise en scene on the one hand. And the urgency of contemporary politics on the other.

I'm also following Michele Hilmes here who has unearthed the battles for control that made serial radio dramas tick and hum in this period. The women who wrote and produced serial dramas struggled against the conservative imperatives of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the form, to provide more complicated women characters with fuller and messier public lives.

And if this seems less like a less death-defying risk than those Corwin took in the 1940s, then perhaps the metaphor isn't a high wire act, but more of a teeter-totter.

Soap operas had to balance the demands of convention with those of the collisions of public and private institutions, for which radio has always been a vector.

When it comes to critical earspace, "Judy and Jane" poses particular, though not unique, difficulty: there are almost no extant recordings of the program to be found.

I note the important exception of the "Reefer Episode," which has been made available to us by Mr. Paul Korman, who sits on Executive Council of the Old Time Radio Researchers.

Soap operas I should add, and I'm not blaming Paul for this, but they're under-represented among the collections,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

recordings for fans that commercial vendors have circulated for decades. So anything we can do to dig up more would be welcome.

The temptation to read "Judy and Jane's" relationship and family arrangement queerly is nearly irresistible. There are passages of "Judy and Jane" which can be difficult to understand as anything other than an inducement to do so.

One such is a 1937 scene in which Jane surprises Judy in the bath. As the thick steam slowly evaporates, Jane begins to see the contours of Judy's body. They laugh and joke and tease. It's steamy. But the imperatives of the emerging serial format also provides ample alibis to explain the relationship otherwise: the constant deferral of romantic closure between the heroines and their male suitors is critical to the form. The companionate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

intimacy among women conjures an ideal social imaginary for products like Folgers Coffee to hail an imagined homosocial daytime audience. And, of course, the scripts provide just enough evidence of Judy's grudging affection for Jerry and Jane's anxiety to please Donald, to satisfy the traditional expectations of daytime serials and compulsory heterosexuality.

Attempts at listening from the "Cultural Front" earspace of the '30s also meet infuriating obstacles to confident interpretation. The Petticoat Party's progressivism and feminism verge into dubious moral crusading and out again. Judy is perhaps the first hero in American popular culture to be a tax assessor.

But she's never quite so passionate as when she's busting up a roadhouse with a hastily constituted posse of toughs. Violent crusades against vice in the name of children, have a murky

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

political provenance.

Even when playing the Rich-Cad-versus -the-Poor-Girl card, the scripts intentionally sow ambiguity. As when Donald North, Jane's ardent suitor, argues for the virtue of hereditary class over more democratic ideals. This argument arises while he attempts to persuade Jane to quit her job, leave Judy, and marry him. (A neat bundle of conservative values in one package.)

The production notes urge, "Please play Donald sympathetically. He's not to deliver any of his lines in a mean or definitely antagonistic fashion. He merely sees a plan of his threatened. And in his masculine way wants to run things."

This teeter-tottering may well represent the political balancing act that Hilmes saw in the production of the serial narratives of Irna Phillips in the same era, where network executives and sponsors tussled with writers about the extent of autonomy that soap opera heroines should enjoy.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

"Judy and Jane's" multi-cultural working class circle of friends and associates recall the left populism that Denning, Lizabeth Cohen, Lewis Ehrenberg, and Larry May have uncovered in the popular films and other media of the period. Longshoremen, merchant marines, immigrant farmers, Jewish filmmakers, along with the working class shoppers of the revamped Red Front store; it's like they reverse-engineered their arguments into an ideal text.

And Judy's lines are written in the working class patois and verbal slapstick that we associate with the immigrant working class popular culture of the period. She says things like, "You buttered your bread, now lie in it." And, "When we get into these joints, let's wreck 'em."

Moving from the text which offers such compelling evidence to the industrial and production side of things, presents still more complexity. If "Judy and Jane" represents the ideal type for a left historians' account of a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

"Cultural Front," the Hummert soap opera factory of which it is part, stands in a similar relationship to Adorno and Horkheimer's Culture Industry. The Frankfurt School version of The World Made Flesh. Culture produced in this way, couldn't help but be reactionary, even fascistic.

Swinging back the other way, the Hummerts, alone among big time radio producers, simply flouted the Blacklist of the 1950s, continuing to hire writers, actors, and producers regardless of their appearance in the notorious publication, "Red Channels."

This refusal to capitulate is usually understood as the prerogative of an empire too big to be intimidated. But it also leaves open the possibility of a soap opera "Cultural Front."

Questions of authorship yield thoroughly opaque results. "Judy and Jane" was that rare soap opera with only one writer to its official credit in most sources. That writer, Robert Hardy Andrews, the most prolific writer in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the Hummert factory and eventually a Hollywood script writer, is--big surprise--hard to pin down in terms of social, and political commitments.

Andrews' Hollywood screen writing credits, taken together, appear to constitute a deliberate effort at obfuscation. His films trafficked in anti-lynching sentiment and jingoistic racism. His writing partner, Ben Maddow, was a member of the Communist Party and was eventually blacklisted.

Andrews, however, took the job of writing "The Woman on Pier 13," a piece of anti-communist propaganda so pure that Howard Hughes, the producer, used it as a political litmus test to discern the politics of the directors to whom he offered jobs. Most turned it down--not Andrews.

However, he may have tried to turn the message on its head, naming the hectoring, inquisitorial communist boss in the film "Nixon." Whatever his spot on the ideological teeter-totter,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

there's no question that moving from right to left and left to right, was a central component of the cultural work of Hollywood and radio.

Audience research, such as it was, indicates that listeners to "Judy to Jane" were disproportionately rural and poorly educated. While not dispositive for any ideological diagnosis, it certainly doesn't support the urban immigrant, cosmopolitanism associated with Denning's "Cultural Front" audiences.

Remember I said there was one extant episode of the seeries? It's known as "The Reefer Episode" and dates from 1942--long after the show's brief regional network runs, which ended in 1935. After 1935, [the show] was distributed through the more informal networks of transcription disks throughout the Midwest.

The important thing with this one episode is that we can actually hear the lines performed and perhaps get closer to imagining the earspace of 1942, if not the 1930s.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Audio played)

DR. LOVIGLIO: Could we play it again, because the first part is the interesting part? It's really short.

(Audio played)

DR. LOVIGLIO: Okay and then the next one.

(Audio played)

DR. LOVIGLIO: Okay, there's another one but I'm not going to push my luck with time. So that's good... All right. So imagine my surprise in listening to this episode and finding that Jane has at some point married Donald North, eliminating the exquisite tension that "Judy and Jane" had maintained as single women living together by choice throughout the 1930s scripts.

Worse, Judy is essentially absent from the episode, so we don't get to hear if her working-class accent survives the entry into the war years. Still crazier, is the fact that all my research on Robert Hardy Andrews, in the service of the auteur theory

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of "Judy and Jane," comes to naught when Irving Vendig of "Perry Mason" and "The Edge of Night" fame, is announced as the program author and episode host.

Further, the risible anti-marijuana theme and mawkish representation of teen addicts in this episode is pure "Reefer Madness" camp--making it difficult to imagine the earspace in which it was first received as anything other than reactionary.

Jane--and Donald, who's a candidate for county attorney--represent law and order in this episode. And Nick Rodin, the drug dealer, represents the arrogance of organized crime. They all speak in the placeless accent-less mid-Atlantic English of golden age radio newscasts and posh advertisements -- and that's what I really wanted you to hear was Jane's horribly vanilla voice.

I also wanted you to hear [that] which is most surprisingly -- the episode that's been packaged and framed with these extra diegetical and fourth-wall breaking elements that were entirely

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

missing from the 1930s scripts. So you heard you know, "Let me take this down" and "Now I'm going to do another radio trick." And then his voice goes down and then he asks the audio engineer to do this. So that's all new.

At the end, it becomes clear that this episode is actually a sort of mid-series pilot for the program. Filled with back story, exposition, and promotional chatter. And this is borne out in the production notes in the link that Paul gave us.

It's a show about the show, basically. It's not even an episode of "Judy and Jane." Perhaps, by 1942, the producers were hoping for another regional or even national network hookup, or perhaps the pilot was a necessity for programs that lived and died by their success in breaking new markets via transcription disks one local station at a time.

In any case, the single extant recording of "Judy and Jane" is so different from the scripts of 1930s in authorship, tone, in the characters,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and their roles, and in their use of language, as to constitute a completely different show. Which makes one wonder about the value of reading words meant to be performed and heard, if not recorded.

And it makes me wonder also about the limits of listening as well, especially to that precious and not always representative remnant of recorded sound.

There are it seems many "Judy and Janes." The one in the scripts in the building next door, the one in the sound file that I just played for you, the "Judy and Jane" of the '30s, the "Judy and Jane" of the war years, the ones from up and down the teeter-totter of critical earspaces from which we might listen and read.

Putting many readings in play, and allowing many readings to compete is perhaps a modest outcome for archival research. And I do harbor wild ambitions that the RPTF will help me find more recordings of the program. But asking what kinds of listening are even historically

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

possible, and which one are unavoidable no matter what the year, points us towards better scholarships, and reminds us of the things that cannot be retrieved even by acetate disk, magnetic wire or tape.

Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Thank you, Jason. And our next speaker is Catherine Martin. Catherine is a PhD candidate from Boston University, American and New England Studies. Her dissertation explores what it meant to be a good girl in post-war radio and television crime drama.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you everyone. Thank you Jennifer for organizing this, and thank you everyone for coming.

So my paper today is "Do Detectives Get Privacy?" And I'm focusing on one radio show, "Candy Matson." Jeanette is smiling because I spent quite a bit of time in her archive looking at the scripts for this paper.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And as this is an archival presentation, and presentation conference, I figured I would begin by talking a bit about the difficulty of researching a series like "Candy Matson." Or as I've begun to call it, my list of Archive World Problems.

And then I'm going to move on to exploring some of the interesting areas that the archive has opened up for my research which focuses on gender and how it's shaped in radio and television programs, in dialog with cultural attitudes towards gender in the post-war era.

So, as some of you know, "Candy Matson" aired on NBC's West Coast network from June 1949 to May 1951. It originated from KNBC in San Francisco. It was produced by Monty Masters and starred his wife, Natalie.

While the series was apparently quite popular locally, it never found a sponsor or made it to the national network. Its presence in the NBC archive housed in Madison, Wisconsin, is limited to a single audition recording of which no listener

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

copy has been made.

I didn't know that you had to request them two weeks ahead of time, so I wasn't able to listen to it, but there are a few stray mentions in program lists from station files that are peppered throughout executive's papers. Luckily, all the scripts are available in Monty Masters' papers which are housed at the American Broadcasting Archive in Thousand Oaks, and apparently they're also at the Library of Congress, Jack has just told me. And at least 14 recordings still exist from the series' nearly two year run, which luckily does give us some idea of how Natalie performed the role.

However, while the script collection is extensive, and it does include this delightful in-house publication -- sorry for the blurry picture... From an in-house KNBC publication, that shows how important the series was to the station at least. The archives' lack of correspondence makes it difficult to trace a detailed production history. We can verify that Monty initially

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

intended to play the role of Candy himself, as he's listed as playing Candy in the credits of one undated audition script. But we can't really know how NBC executives felt about the series or why the network never managed to sell it to a sponsor.

One especially frustrating dead end involves a tantalizing hint that Natalie helped to write the series in which she starred. The cover sheet of another undated audition script lists her as writer, and Monty as director, though only Monty is mentioned in the credits that are read over the air. And he's the only writer ever credited on any other scripts.

This is particularly disappointing in the context of a study of an industry where so many women's contributions, as we've already heard, have been erased. And it's even more disappointing when studying a hard-boiled detective drama because that particular niche of the mystery genre overall has tended to preclude and deny female participation despite the fact that women have always been avid

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

consumers of crime narratives.

Candy's actual audience is also difficult to measure because the series didn't leave much of a record in popular publications and fan magazines, at least not the ones that are easily accessible. As this Arclike graph shows, a search of Project Lantern databases of digitized fan magazines and industry publications returns exactly two hits.

There's a "Broadcasting and Telecasting" blurb about the series receiving an award from the "San Francisco Examiner." You can see it circled in red. And then there's another one about Candy appearing at KNBC's antenna switch celebration. Natalie played the role on some special broadcast.

This past week I managed to track down another article from the "Times of San Mateo" that documents widespread audience panic after one episode in which Candy appears to die in a plane crash, which does show that it was popular. People

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

were worried. I think 800 people called KNBC to make sure she was going to be okay.

A search of ProQuest's "LA Times" database turns up 18 hits, all of which are radio schedule listings. And I'm currently in the process of combing through the "San Francisco Chronicle" and "Examiner" on microfilm. Hopefully, those will be more helpful.

While these are helpful in establishing the series popularity and importance to KNBC, they don't provide a well-rounded picture of the series and its audience.

Of course as with other radio programs, this paper record has been augmented by the oral histories taken by researchers and fans alike.

These histories add much to our knowledge. For example, the fact that Monty decided to cast Natalie as Candy after talking to Natalie's mother. But many are not widely available and they can't answer every question that a researcher might want to ask.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So, moving onto archived-based speculation. What can we glean from the archives and how do we go about asking the questions we want answered? For me these questions revolve around radio writers and producers deliberately or subconsciously shaping representations of women to adhere to specific gender roles.

These are always difficult questions to ask of any archive, as producers and writers rarely want to admit or even realize that they are creating a specific and limited version of reality through their work. And so they don't leave many traces.

So far, the most honest source I found on this front has been NBC's continuity acceptance reports, but even those are limited. Incredible reading though.

For today, however, I'd like to focus on this one note scrawled on the top of a script intended to air on Christmas Eve, 1950. What can we get from this note to "Clean up living alone?" It isn't clear who was meant to receive this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

instruction or who recorded it. The hand writing I haven't been able to quite identify. It may be Monty Masters, but it's definitely not Jack Thomas, Henry Leff, or Natalie.

(Off the record comments)

What? And that may be another issue. I think for my purposes, that it still has the same meaning. But yes, you're right. I actually was debating whether it was "clear" or "clean." Oh, for the days when we all knew how to read handwriting!

It's also hard to tell if this suggestion or edict applies to this episode specifically. Or if it's a more general recommendation for the series going forward. It doesn't seem to be followed -- there are no notes within the episode itself to indicate that it's been followed through in this episode.

In the episode we don't actually see Candy in her apartment, but she is at a client's apartment. The client thinks he's living alone. He thinks he's being haunted by a ghost. It's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

actually his wife who is trying to teach him a lesson. And they end up happy at the end. It's a Christmas episode. It's going to be happy.

However, this note does fit in with a more general trend that I've noticed as I read through other "Candy Matson" scripts in their broadcast order: the effort to define Candy in terms of increasingly stereotypical feminine traits and to root her in feminine spaces despite her apparently masculine profession.

And the remainder of this paper examines those efforts -- especially the effort to create private domestic spaces within the larger context of post-war attitudes about what constituted normal femininity.

As historians like Elaine Tyler May have pointed out, domestic containment was a crucial part of post-war American life, especially for women. After working in war industries through the early 1940s, women were strongly encouraged to return to the home in peace time.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

While scholars like Jessica Weiss have complicated our understanding of post-war women's domesticity by showing how even white middle class women, who were the ones thought to be most consistently domestic, moved in and out of the labor force through the 1950s and 60s, popular culture as a whole promoted a strongly domestic image of women's lives. As Jason Loviglio has shown, even before the War was over, popular radio series like "Vox Pop" encouraged female participants to think in terms of their post-war domestic lives.

Roy Grundmann has shown how movies like "The Strange Love of Martha Ivers" demonized the ambitious women who chose work over family life. Beyond simply identifying women with the home, however, ideas about women's spaces were bound up with concerns about safety and women's ability to defend themselves, or their supposed lack thereof.

These concerns reached an apex in the well-publicized panics over the New York City, Career Girl Murders of the 1960s when a string of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

murders of young career women living alone became an argument for why women shouldn't live alone, especially for people uncomfortable with the increasing numbers of single working women.

However, one of the core conventions of the detective genre is the fact that any decent detective must command both public and private spaces. This is true whether the detective is male or female, police officer, or private eye.

Indeed there is no such thing as private space for a detective, for he invades other's privacy repeatedly over the course of any investigation. And, especially in hard-boiled narratives, others invade his.

The moment when some criminal and conspirator breaks into a PI's apartment, and either kidnaps or knocks him out, it's frequently a turning point in the case. And at the very least, it's the point when things get personal.

But what if he is a she? And what if she is a single women living alone in post-war San

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Francisco? Can she defend herself in her home? And how should she feel about that home?

Candy may have talked, investigated and even gotten knocked out like a man. But the problem of her gender was never far from the program's surface. One early script even makes a joke of the fact that working women were perceived as inherently suspect, with the announcer commenting that Candy is, quote, "A working girl too. Whenever she gets a case. Oh, don't misunderstand me, what I mean is she's a private detective," end quote.

The steady increase in feminizing touches throughout the series' brief run highlights the scrutiny placed on post-war representations of women and the pressure writers felt to offer safely conservative images of femininity.

From the beginning, Candy's writers focus on her physicality in a way that was unheard of for male detectives. While the introductions to the first few episodes cut right to the action, later examples subordinate her investigatory prowess to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

her physical beauty.

The third episode -- most of the episodes don't have titles so we just have script dates, this script was dated July 14th, 1949 -- promises audience, quote, "A little whodunit, without too much gore" and "A gal for a detective, not a guy with all muscle and no brain," end quote.

However, it quickly undercuts this promise by adding that, "She's cute too. Oh, and I'll let you in on a little secret. She thinks she's solves all the cases she works on. But she doesn't, not quite. There happens to be a guy named Inspector Ray Mallard, who pulls our gal out of tight spots."

By October, we can hear the announcer, Dudley Manlove, cataloging her physical attributes, further weakening her authority by objectifying her.

(Off the record comments)

(Audio played)

MS. MARTIN: All right, well I was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

trying to pause that.

(Off the record comments)

While Candy's looks work to her advantage in many cases where criminals underestimate her, the series' frequent emphasis on her appearance perpetuates the idea that she is an unrealistic gimmick, not to be taken too seriously in the real world.

Candy's labor is further trivialized by her approach to money. While it is refreshing to hear a radio private eye actually get paid for their cases, the fact that Candy's a single woman working hard to support herself is frequently undercut by her own assertions that she works not for necessities, but to fund a lavish lifestyle including a quote, "A few mink coats," end quote, and that penthouse on Telegraph Hill. Finally, Candy's interest in marriage also increases throughout the series. In the most thorough history of "Candy Matson" to date, Jack French points out that Leff's Inspector Mallard was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

rewritten as Candy's love interest when the detective became a woman. You know, male detectives don't usually have a love interest, especially not a cop.

And as the series progresses, Candy complains more and more, frequently and vocally, about Mallard's apparent neglect and refusal to marry her, until the series concludes with him popping the question and announcing her retirement. At that point, the pair presumably moves to the small cottage covered in vines that she's been dreaming of their sharing.

But back to that penthouse on Telegraph Hill... Unlike most PI's run-down apartments, which are usually presented as little more than a place to sleep and be taken unawares, Candy's penthouse is a real home in which she carries out real domestic activities, including housework and entertaining.

Compare these snippets from one episode of "Candy Matson" with another from an episode of "The Adventures of Sam Spade," another San Francisco

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

PI who Candy's writers strongly imply that she knows.

(Audio played)

MS. MARTIN: And I think I'm running out of time so I'm going to cut that short, but later some cats start yowling. Eventually he gets sucked into a mystery while he's trying to sleep. These are all relatively brief, but they leave a distinctly different impression in the listener's mind.

As we hear, Candy's apartment is a home. It's a place where she spends lots of time and energy. She cooks, she cleans, she suns herself. And she relaxes after a long day with an aggravating client. Even when he does go there seeking rest, Sam's apartment cannot shield him from the urban elements.

Of course Candy's home is not always a private paradise. Because she lacks an office, her place is also a place of work, and no matter how hard she tries to keep the two separate when clients

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

call, she typically arranges to meet them in their own homes, offices or a local bar. She's perfectly happy for Mallard to drop by on a social call, but gets annoyed when he comes by on business.

Still criminals searching for incriminating evidence occasionally do break in and ransack the place, and the building's even set on fire once. While she does her best to shrug off these violations like any good PI, she's not nearly so blasé about it as detectives like Sam.

He uses his apartment as a meeting place to entrap criminals. She actively resists incursions from the outside world and carefully controls who she invites in and the terms under which she permits them to enter.

In one episode, she allows a clearly lecherous movie producer to come over, but only after making clear to him, that "it won't be that kind of meeting." But she becomes enraged when his jealous starlet barges in after him without permission. And that's enough to get them both

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

booted.

Candy is also very careful to police the boundaries of her personal space away from home. Several times throughout the series, she travels with her friend, Rembrandt, and often with Mallard too. But the scripts are always careful to specify that Candy stays separately from the men often on a separate floor or even a different hotel. Modesty is preserved.

So these are just a few examples of how, we can go to these scripts in the archives and see things that might go over our heads while we're listening to a broadcast, or maybe, you know, how the sheer preponderance of scripts really helps to identify these trends.

In case all this sounds like a reach, we can augment this argument by pointing to other instances of radio networks linking female characters with the home.

To stick with the PI genre, Sam's apartment may not be much more than a place to sleep,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

but his loyal secretary, Effie, lives in Oakland with her mother. She even occasionally invites Sam over for dinner. And just in case listeners were still worried about Effie's domestic arrangements, there's this press photo which I just came across this past week in the New York Public Library's extensive ephemera collections.

From this photo we're sure that even if Effie's work pulls her away from home too often, actress Lurene Tuttle is a good wife and mother. We can see her here playing piano with her daughter.

And in case you can't read that, it says, "Contrasting sharply with her radio life as Effie Perrine, spinsterish secretary" -- I call foul on spinster for Effie -- "to hard-boiled detective Sam Spade, as her home life sister act with teenage daughter, Barbara." And they're playing the piano very posed, very happy. Clearly domesticity was on radio producers' mind.

So in conclusion, this post-War radio PI was originally written male, retained much of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the masculine independence that was lacking in other female radio investigators. But she [became] aligned more closely with post-war feminine ideals as the series progressed.

Beyond rewriting Mallard as a love interest, instead of a purely police foil, Masters peppered the scripts for "Candy" with small details about her personal life that reassured the audiences that even if Candy's occupation places her on the edge of respectability, even if she is a working girl, she's not that kind of working girl. And she's still safely feminine.

Furthermore, they link femininity with domestic privacy and reassure listeners that Candy values that privacy even if she can't always control it.

I'd love to be able to tell you that Candy was punished for being too masculine and that was why she never made it to full network radio. But I can't. The network archive has nothing. The existing archive doesn't support it. And there are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

any number of other factors working against the series, including the fact that network radio was steadily losing audiences to TV and that NBC's West Coast production facilities has already coalesced in Hollywood.

However, by exploring the ways that producers strove to change their programs, we can get a better sense of what they, or advertisers, thought the public wanted. And all I can say is I hope we are able to find more and more of these archival sources to help rebuild this picture. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Thank you, Catherine.

(Off the record comments)

MS. MARTIN: I said at one point that he told me that the scripts are in the Library of Congress as well.

PARTICIPANT: I've seen a couple.

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Okay, thank you. So

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

now we have a response from Brent Malin, who is Associate Professor of Communication, University of Pittsburgh. And he's also the Associate Director of the Humanity Center. He's the author of "American Masculinity Under Clinton." And a separate book, "A History of Media Technology and Emotion in America." Brent, thank you.

DR. MALIN: Great, thank you. I'm going to be working from my laptop, so I'm going to sit over here if that's okay. And so I want to start by thanking Jennifer, Jason, and Catherine for sharing these papers with us.

And especially for sharing them with me in advance, so I can say with confidence that these are three very interesting papers that look at issues of gender, radio, and the archive in important and overlapping ways. And I'm going to give a few connecting comments and then a few specific comments for each paper. And then tie them into a few larger ideas to end.

So I would start with a question: What

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is missing when we don't have a recording of the radio program? Well, at least one way audience members might have heard the program, though Jason ends his paper with a good question about the extent to which a recording can give us what the audience experienced.

We also miss the sounds of performer's voices. So what did the mechanic accents of characters in "Judy and Jane" actually sound like? Were they actually there in the same way that they were written into the scripts of the program?

Did the women of "The We Say What We Think Club" say what they thought? And what did that sound like?

How similar to, or different, were these conversations from the scripts that Jennifer has found? What did a "cleaned up" or "cleared up" living alone sound like?

The production notes mentioned in each of these essays are also very interesting and complicate the centrality of audio recordings and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

what we might call a phenomenological history of radio voices.

Audiences for "Candy Matson" likely did not know that its producers wanted a clean, cleared up, living alone. So that note gives us access to an important bit of additional context for the program's production. Though, as Catherine says, there are also lots of production details that are missing that would be very interesting to know. For instance, why Monty Masters didn't ultimately play the lead role of the program? That's really interesting.

The direction to please play Donald sympathetically gives us a very interesting sense of how "Judy and Jane" fits into a larger gender dynamics, in which Jason is contextualizing it.

Again, the script gives us something that may or may not be evident from the recording. Do we hear this sympathy? Likewise direction notes like "All talking together," "Talking over others," or "Butting in," also give us a nice sense of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

producer's views of "The We Say What We Think Club," as well as of how they view the culture of female talk.

Whether this comes off as homey and natural to the at-home audience, or if the women on the program ignored the written directions, these notes give us a very interesting sense of the program's place within its cultural moment.

Jennifer gives us another very interesting bit of context in terms of the oral history she discusses. There's a very interesting parallel between questions about oral history and questions about the radio archive pertaining to lost or potentially lost voices.

The oral history reverses the script voice issues in some interesting ways. But with the radio program, at least the ones we're talking about here, we generally begin with the script, and then we make a program. But with the traditional oral histories before TAPE or RATSASS -- I really like that, I would go with that -- we began with the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

recording, and then made a written transcript.

As anyone who has ever transcribed interviews knows, a lot happens in the translation from an audio recording to a written transcript. What do you do with vocalized pauses, stutters, slang pronunciations, or accents?

Although these are all very natural and normal in most people's speech, transcribing them often makes them seem unnatural and can make an informant, as they're often called in oral histories, sound less intelligent than hearing them might indicate. So some people will just leave those out. When you make a transcript, you leave some of those things out.

Still what kind of new truth did the inventors of TAPE/RATSASS think could quote, "Be discovered from the oral original, not revealed by the typed script"? I think that's very interesting. These ideas tie in nicely with Jason's discussion of the critical earspace.

As he puts it, quote, "It is difficult

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to listen from a critical earspace when confronted with mute scripts, notwithstanding their meticulous stage reactions in the live working class patois of the dialog." I mean -- this is me now. I really do want to hear what it sounds like to quote, "Threaten Jane's virtue as much as possible through innuendo."

DR. LOVIGLIO: I cut that out.

DR. MALIN: Yes, that was cut out. I want to know what that sounds like? But they said, "But keep it innocent." So lines had to be innocent.

Yes, the lines need to be innocent but yes, "Threatens Jane's virtue as much as possible through innuendo." I want to know what that sounds like. Is there a way in which critical listening or whatever precisely happens in a critical earspace can help to answer the questions raised by Jason about the ambivalently gendered space of "Jane and Judy"?

And if this listening can't help answer

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

these questions, can it help us to hear them in a different way?

Jason ends his paper with a skepticism towards both written transcripts and recorded audio. Raymond Williams talks about three levels of culture. What he calls, "The Lived," "The recorded," and "The Selected Tradition." The Selected Tradition is all those things used as iconic emblems of the particular cultural moment.

For us, we could think of the radio programs that we hold up as symbols of radio's golden age. The recorded level of culture includes all those things that get recorded in one way or another out of which many of our selected traditions often emerge.

Think of all the radio programs that we have either found, or might still find out there, somewhere. The Lived Level of culture is that level for Williams, known only to those people who are living at a particular moment in time.

In many ways, Jason's paper asks us

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

whether we can read the Lived culture from the Recorded one?

I think William's answer would be, no. But how strong a "no," is perhaps up for debate, as is what precisely we're trying to do in terms of understanding some level of culture, or something else when we read programs, for instance, that offer various depictions of gender in a particular moment in time?

Catherine's paper deals with some similar issues of gender in the archive, discussing "Candy Matson," a program with direct relevance to the kinds of claims Michael Denning makes about the "Cultural Front."

How we begin to figure out if "Candy Matson" challenges gender ideals? Does hearing the program, as we just have in part, help us answer one or the other of these questions?

As an aside, I think it's really interesting that CBS in the example that Catherine gives in her paper that we just saw, felt the need

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to emphasize that the actress Lurene Tuttle is appropriately gendered even [versus] the character she plays in "The adventures of Sam Spade." I mean, it's very interesting.

And this makes some really interesting assumptions about the audiences' relationship to the program and to the actor. And stakes a direct claim about actual working women in addition of fictional ones. So we know she's working. So we need some verification it seems, that she's still a good mother.

Again, the question about how the producers of "Candy Matson" worked to deliberately shape the gender roles on the program is very interesting here. It seems like there might be the potential for the kind of clear earspace that Jason discusses as well, not only in the potential gender inversions of having a women depicted as detective but in the fact that Natalie might literally be playing her husband's role.

Right, it was supposed to be him. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

then she does it, and the more we know about that, that seems very interesting again. I think this is very interesting and I agree with Catherine that it would be nice to know more about this.

And again, this is something we couldn't necessarily hear from the program itself. And we need those other bits of context to help us fill in and make sense of this history.

And I think each of these papers tie in -- this is going to be kind of my larger questions and conclusion a little bit here -- I think each of these papers tie in, in a very interesting way, to Paddy Scannell's opening remarks about hearing versus listening.

I swear this is the only part that I wrote of this this morning -- perhaps a script, in Paddy's words, gives us access to listening but not to hearing. In that we can get some sense of the content of whatever broadcast we're discussing but not necessarily the grain of the voice of any given speaker, as he said. And quoting Roland Barthes:

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

"What would it mean to hear the gender tensions at work in these three programs versus listening to them?" Kate Smith's broadcast discussed by Paddy and also in "Mass Persuasion," might be a good indication of this. Part of what the listener's interviewed in "Mass Persuasion" comment on when talking about Smith's sincerity is how her voice changes over the course of the long broadcast.

Right, it's a marathon broadcast. And so she sounds sincere to the listeners they say in large part because she keeps talking for such a long time. So, by the end, her voice is cracking and they can hear that she's very tired, but she's still there. So they note, she must be sincere if she does this for such a long time even though it's painful for her.

What can we know about this by hearing it for ourselves versus hearing it through these interviewees? If hearing it is the correct phrase here? I mean, you know --

I would add one thing to Paddy's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

discussion; I think is relevant here too: when we hear recordings of audio broadcasts, we also hear the technology through which they are recorded. And perhaps broadcasted depending on the recording. In that sense, perhaps a recorded broadcast is not as different from a written oral history interview than it might first seem. The technology of recording leaves a mark on the thing it records. And we could say, [it] makes choices of what to include, and what not to include. Or how to frame the recorded object? The grain of the voice on a recording often includes the grain of the recording as well.

A recording captures something of the original broadcast, but adds something too. Of course we might be interested in studying that added thing too, by the recorded medium, depending on what it is.

Obviously, this creates many complex layers of meaning and analysis, complicated all the more by the topics discussed in the papers here.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

We can hear and listen to, as and for, the producers of a program, the audience of a program, the actors within a program, and perhaps the broadcast and recording technology and many other things.

So I find the ways that these papers are addressing these complex issues, very interesting and I'm very glad that Jennifer, Jason, and Catherine are working on these important topics. Thanks.

(Applause)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Would anyone like to respond too? Well, questions? Okay.

PARTICIPANT: I've got --

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Sure.

PARTICIPANT: I, as you're thinking about different ways that scripts and recordings differ, there's even a further validation sometimes with scripts. We've got a collection of NBC Master books on micro file. And somebody for some of these was going along and was listening as it happened and occasionally she lines a script across that,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

or there are notes in there? And they're listening, I mean NBC in part is recording for legal reasons. So, I mean, there's another audience involved too in a way. So that's just another combination.

MS. MARTIN: No, it's definitely really interesting.

PARTICIPANT: Is what's on the script even, what was on the recording to begin with?

MS. MARTIN: Yes, it's interesting when you're going through different versions of scrips, because I mean like the Holy Grail is if you have like two or three different ones that go from the first draft, and then there will be some that are marked, "as broadcast." And it's really hard to tell even with the "as broadcast" one.

There are often still things crossed out and was it crossed out for time? Was it crossed out because, who --

PARTICIPANT: Maybe somebody didn't pay attention to detail.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, did someone forget

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

something, was it flubbed, or did someone actually have a problem with what was being said?

So it's really hard to draw these conclusions. But it's also really interesting to see all these different variations.

PARTICIPANT: I had a quick-- Jen, did the ladies disagree on anything? Or was it sort of happy, happy consensus all the time?

MS. WANG: What we can get from the scripts, they really marked them up, so that they met --. And then an hour before the broadcast, they got the script from the Dane County Agent.

So he wrote up, this is what you guys were talking about. And he did this for about five years. Before then they just took notes and then they operated by themselves.

But they -- I lost my train of thought.

PARTICIPANT: Did they butt heads?

MS. WANG: Oh, did they butt heads? No, not really. I mean she talks about minorly, that there's some political issues that they kind of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

danced around a little bit. But it was mostly there was one or two of the women who were a little bit more serious. So they were trying to get her off of serious topics. And just you know, so being congenial actually was a really important point of that, for them on that program.

CHAIR HARALOVICH: How long were they together in there?

MS. WANG: Twenty years.

CHAIR HARALOVICH: How long is the duration of one of their --

MS. WANG: It was about 15 minutes.

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Fifteen minutes.. Was it a question?

PARTICIPANT: I just wanted to toss out another interpretation of the Lurene Tuttle photograph. Too bad we couldn't get close enough to see if they're playing a complicated theme. It says something about them both.

The character of Effie is so cringe worthy to listen to. So effectively done that in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

a way to see a photograph of Lurene Tuttle in her normal life, if anything speaks to her effectiveness, as an actress or modernizer and so in that sense, it's almost really flattering to her capabilities. So that rather than seeing it as an objectification, it's sort of a deep mythologizing of the Effie character.

MS. MARTIN: No, and that's interesting because I don't know that I really necessarily really see this. I mean I see, Candy being objectified when they're describing her as an object. I'm not really sure that I interpret Lurene Tuttle's photo as objectification so much as just showing her in a domestic setting. And that was kind of a common --

(Off the record comments)

MS. MARTIN: That was kind of a common trope. I mean they're like in, I think, it's "Radio Mirror," there's an article. I'm blanking on which detective it was, but it was written from the point of view of the actor's wife.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Talking about him at home being domestic. So there's definitely something about taking the edge off of these detective characters. But yes, Lurene Tuttle, she was just this amazing actress. She was in everything.

What I object --

PARTICIPANT: First lady of radio and that is why.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, well, what I object to in that photo mostly was them calling Effie a spinster. Because she's, I mean she seems so young and but I guess --

(Off the record comments)

MS. MARTIN: I don't see her. I guess the difference is that I don't see her as being cringe-worthy exactly. I just, I mean you know, a little, the character is sometimes... But I just, I find her more really interesting.

PARTICIPANT: Sometimes the use of the word "spinster" is a prediction, not just the current setup.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MS. MARTIN: Yes, and I guess my thing is I always, I read a lot of the Effie-Sam relationship as kind of like an office marriage. Where like, it's kind of implied that you know maybe eventually if he ever retired, maybe they'd get married. You know, she's waiting for him.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, that was my question because don't they --

MS. MARTIN: They kiss repeatedly.

PARTICIPANT: They [enter] a slightly risqué territory, every now and then. And it's sort of implies that Effie's there whenever Sam wants her, but he's mostly a gentleman.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, but she, well you know it's like she's --

PARTICIPANT: She worships him.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, she worships him. She's in love with him. I mean and again this is my reading. But she's in love with him. She probably wants to marry him. But you know she lives with her mother. So she's safe. He wouldn't, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

know, damage her, so...

PARTICIPANT: I find it interesting your run in with the oral history. Back in the, around 1950, I think it was Columbia University and the Oral History Association, made up the rules for oral history.

Their first big client, and we're talking about big, being thousands, and thousands of dollars, was the Broadcast Pioneers Association. And one of the first results of the 50 or more interviews that they did under that contract was a 1956 "American Heritage" article, which was a great article.

And the thing is they did not know that the recordings were not being saved. And all they were getting was the transcript. And Kathy Hines, who was the librarian of Broadcast Pioneers Library, told me this story.

She said, when the Association found out, you're livid with rage, would be just an understatement. You know, that the recordings had

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

not, of the Broadcast Pioneers, had not been saved. Because they made the contract to do those interviews, so that they would have the sound recordings of all these broadcast pioneers.

PARTICIPANT: A bunch of irony in that -- *broadcasters*.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, right. And then that's all you have is a little couple of minutes snippets of each of the people. And they were furious. And we have been discussing that in the 1970s at the Association of Recorded Sound Collections. You know by that time all of us had shamed the Oral History Association. And literally shamed them into maintaining the tapes.

That's the only way we could do it.

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Yes, thank you for doing it.

PARTICIPANT: These were fantastic papers and they're building off of Brent's comment. One thing that strikes me that is a sort of challenge from this kind of work, and we're all struggling

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

with that I think aesthetically -- to one extent, when you look at a radio script, you have to draw on a kind of a literary sort of, the tradition of textual theory, interpretive theory around ideas for example of authorial intention versus some kind of a new criticism.

Where the scholar is the definitive reader. This is my reading of the grain of the voice, or the clearness of this text, or whatever. Or something that is more structural. For dealing with scripts that you don't know, if this is actually the final version that went out over the air at all?

Or recordings that may or may not be the masters of this one. So these are just challenges to the kind of aesthetic, historical market we all want to do. And I just wondered if you might share with us a little bit how you think about textural interpretation in that sense when you're looking at a radio script, or an oral history transcript?

DR. LOVIGLIO: Go ahead.

DR. MALIN: Yes, I mean I guess by the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

end I decided that none of the things I studied could tell me anything about the time in which they were made. But they were enormously pleasurable to play with. To use, to go, in a Barthesian direction.

I just think it's the stuff that is still relevant, and engaging, and enticing, and intriguing is the stuff that is the remnant. That's what survives. The ways it speaks to me, the ways it sends me on goose chases. So it's the attempt to find some kind of remnant of ideological battle and the frustrations of it.

To me that was really the only thing that was coherent, rather than the ability to reconstruct something definitive. And I don't know if that's because I ran into so many problems with this particular thing. Or if that is just a generalizable kind of throwing up of one's hands. But it's a pleasurable one.

MS. MARTIN: Yes. I mean it's interesting and it's a question that I deal with in terms of what's on the page and also in terms

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of the my critical listening position [is] because I'm coming at this from a feminist media studies' point of view.

And this is a pre second-wave feminism period that I'm studying. So it's interesting to see you know, am I reading too much into this? Am I reading not enough into this? And I guess, at the end of the day, the best I can do is say, This is what I have. This is the approach I'm using. And I could spend my life questioning whether or not this script is the be-all and end-all of it. At a certain point, you have to write.

I'm not sure if that's the answer you're looking for. But, yes, with "Candy Matson," there are several copies of scripts. But most of them are just different people's copies, so they're fairly consistent. And that is nice in that I can verify that if there are differences -- like if the same line is edited out of two or three different people's copy of the script -- I can pretty much assume that it probably was edited out of the final broadcast.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And then I can also compare the existing episodes that are there.

PARTICIPANT: Well that was what I was going to --

PARTICIPANT: There are two Jennifers.

PARTICIPANT: Changes are always made while the show is on the air.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, that's right. I'd like Jennifer to comment on --

MS. WANG: I guess I just want to say that one of the problems of the work that we do in radio is all of the absences and the gaps. And I think that what causes you to be a little bit more tentative, a little less eager to jump to conclusions.

And I think that that quote that was in my paper by Alessandro Portelli that, "You're looking at what people thought they were doing," is something that's going to stick with me for a while, you know as a scholar trying to -- because I see my grasp as a this sort of taking all these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

little bitty scraps of paper, whether it's from a production note or a script, and putting [them] together and trying to figure out what were the most likely ways in which these discourses were circulating around.

And that's about all I can do because I don't know how they read them. And I didn't know how they listened to them or heard them, but I got to get this paper done! So I'm guessing ...

CHAIR HARALOVICH: I think we're going to have to wrap up soon, but in the back, you had questions.

PARTICIPANT: Well, this problem of favoring the transcript over the recording doesn't just apply to the radio. It's much more widespread than that.

When I was working on my MLS in the late '70s, we took a field trip to a presidential library and I asked them if they had any sound recordings of the President. And they said, "Oh, yes." And they're transcribing them. I said well, "What do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

you do with the recordings?"

"We discard them after they're transcribed. Well, having the written word is what's important, not having the recording."

PARTICIPANT: No, that's not true. The recordings are there.

PARTICIPANT: No.

PARTICIPANT: The recordings are kept.

PARTICIPANT: What Library are you talking about?

PARTICIPANT: Truman.

PARTICIPANT: They got him. They've got the recordings.

PARTICIPANT: Definitely, Nixon.

(Simultaneous speaking)

CHAIR HARALOVICH: Okay, I think that's it. We're going to wrap it up.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:04 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

