

When Radio Ruled: The Social Life of Sound

Tona Hangen

Theater of the Mind: Imagination, Aesthetics, and American Radio Drama. By Neil Verma. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012. 296 pages. \$90.00 (cloth). \$31.00 (paper).

Sound Business: Newspapers, Radio, and the Politics of New Media. By Michael Stamm. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011. 264 pages. \$45.00 (cloth). \$45.00 (e-book).

Radio's Civic Ambition: American Broadcasting and Democracy in the 1930s. By David Goodman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 368 pages. \$55.00 (cloth). Companion website: <http://global.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780195394085/>.

The Listener's Voice. By Elena Razlogova. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011. 224 pages. \$40.00 (cloth). \$40.00 (e-book). Companion website: <http://thelistenersvoice.org/>.

Radio Fields: Anthropology and Wireless Sound in the Twenty-First Century. Edited by Lucas Bessire and Daniel Fisher. New York: New York University Press, 2012. 298 pages. \$72.00 (cloth). \$27.00 (paper).

The scene: the boardwalk of Asbury Park, New Jersey, on a summer's day in July 1921, teeming with ladies in white dresses and summer hats, men in suits and straw boaters. Real estate salesman Harold Warren sets up a radio (his carefully lettered sign calls it a "wireless telephone") mounted on a roller chair to tune in to the heavyweight match between George Carpentier and Jack Dempsey, fifty miles away, for other beachgoers. This novelty draws a crowd. Someone takes a photograph. Warren sends it to the National Amateur Wireless Association, which publishes it in its magazine along with his rapt description of the clear transmission of crowd noise and even the bell between rounds. What makes this little moment worthy of pause, as Elena Razlogova explains

in the opening chapter of her book *The Listener's Voice*, is that “it was not a live broadcast. Announcer J. Owen Smith in Hoboken had read a description wired from the arena, banging a studio bell between rounds. Listeners heard crowds when there were none” (11). She adds that emerging radio stations soon discovered that their audiences were eager for prizefighting and learned how to broadcast sporting events to enthrall listeners like the Asbury Park boardwalk crowd; but the story reminds us that radio broadcasting is a fiction masquerading as truth, an electronic signal perceived as human-made sound, a set of social relations mediated (not merely transmitted) by dynamic—and unpredictable—technology.

Razlogova's book is one of a spate of innovative and provocative new works from the field of radio studies, which has been happily growing in its own corner but deserves to be more widely known.¹ The books under consideration here treat a variety of perspectives: business history, intellectual history, cultural and media studies, anthropology, and aesthetics—but they share a common fascination with how radio constitutes cultural meaning now and in the past. While the “golden age” of analog broadcast radio may be over in the United States, the questions it generated about American identity, democracy, and culture are still as fresh as ever. When these scholars delve into radio's fragmentary archival record to study radio's past, it is not out of sheer nostalgia alone. As Lucas Bessire and Daniel Fisher, editors of *Radio Fields*, an anthology of new global research in anthropology of radio and mediated sound, put it: “Radio is the most widespread electronic medium in the world today. More than a precedent for television, film, or the Internet, radio remains central to the everyday lives of billions of people around the globe” (1). Radio is not over, and radio deeply matters. Studying it yields insights that will appeal to scholars across a range of disciplines.

One reason that radio remains such a productive topic is that it hosts a multiverse of meanings. In her meditation on the linguistic aspects of Zambian epistemologies of radio culture, Debra Vidali-Spitulnik explains that the word *radio* means, all at once, “the machine, the transmission, the institution, a program, a voice, and/or the sounds” (in Bessire and Fisher 260). The editors themselves argue that radio is “best imagined not as a thing at all,” for its “objectness is always potentially unsettled by shifting social practices, institutions, and technological innovations and by the broader domains within which it finds shape, meaning, and power” (2). In social theory terms, radio is an “actor-network” (evoking Bruno Latour), or an “apparatus,” after Michel Foucault (3).² It can be unpacked in many ways to reveal worlds of signification and culturally specific ways of knowing. Marshall McLuhan famously

described media as extending humanity's physical senses outward; Walter Ong argued that while the human sensorium "is determined by culture . . . at the same time, it makes culture: if one can understand the sensorium, one can understand culture" (237).³ In other words, grasping how people use radio and other forms of mediated sound goes a long way toward understanding deep cultural assumptions, values, and practices of being human in a particular time and place. In the twentieth-century United States, radio played a central role in social life, economy, politics, identity, and popular culture—yet radio studies is still curiously marginalized in relation to film, television, and literary studies. These works advance the twin goals of strengthening collective historical memory of radio's diversity and significance and theorizing the scholarship of sound as a cultural text.

The main outline of radio history in the United States is well-trodden and goes something like this: after a burst of experimentation dominated by amateurs, government found a way to regulate and businesses found a way to commercialize radio, and for several decades the medium was dominated by corporations cooperating with government interests. Thus built on advertising and commerce, network radio socialized its commodified listeners to a national mass culture, yet still managed to reflect that society's fractures and tensions (racial, economic, gender, political) with its varied programming. Radio contributed to the project of democracy during the New Deal (though whether by design or by accident is still an open historical question) and largely voluntarily served the cause of patriotic wartime unity during World War II. Radio's "golden age" ended with the advent of television, when radio reinvented itself as arbiter of popular musical tastes through mainstream Top 40 FM formatting, while the AM dial housed pockets of talk, news, religious, local, and ethnic broadcasting. More recently, introduction of digital formats and Internet delivery has further fragmented the media landscape and to some extent overshadowed radio but has not succeeded in killing it. While none of this is disputed outright, the new scholarship explores more complicated stories on the edges and margins, where things get especially interesting.

Neil Verma returns to recordings of golden age radio dramatic programs and listens anew. His refreshing, thoughtful *Theater of the Mind* establishes a theory of radio aesthetics through close readings of programs and genres, a method of "excavational listening" that he calls "media archaeology . . . the paleontology of experience" (228). Recognizing that we can never hear with historical ears, Verma nonetheless takes radio programs seriously as art—art about the self, especially—and as evidence of ambient ideas about interiority, identity, and consciousness. Extensive examples draw the reader into compelling radio

dramas of messages and signals, transmission and vulnerability, loquaciousness and silence, ventriloquism and metabroadcasts. He finds radio theater often expressing psychic stresses *about* radio: radio, in other words, thinking aloud about the radio-listening mind. By deconstructing such theater's formal aspects, Verma shows how radio drama accomplished unforgettable narrative realism through artifice and careful acoustic design.

Michael Stamm's tidy book, *Sound Business*, follows the money. He explores the phenomenon of radio ownership by newspapers, which increased dramatically from the 1920s to the 1940s. His book asks who underwrote radio, and to what end, tracing economic and corporate systems as media empires became increasingly concentrated during radio's golden age. Stamm offers a valuable corrective to the myth that radio replaced print media by showing that radio was, in very many cases, literally bankrolled by newspapers—all the more interesting in light of the current trend toward media consolidation, which has more profitable visual and electronic media companies throwing merger lifelines to drowning print papers.

In *Radio's Civic Ambition*, David Goodman eavesdrops as the chattering class takes on radio in the 1930s. His rambling, detailed intellectual history situates radio's governing men (and yes, they are all men) in their intellectual context. In the 1920s, radio networks made a "Faustian bargain" with the state, promising to be public-minded in exchange for light regulation. The media intelligentsia dreamed that radio could generate an active, open-minded citizenry by modeling dialogue, featuring (contained) diversity, and airing highbrow culture. Though influential, and in fact far more widespread than is usually credited, this "civic ambition" was still a minority elite viewpoint. Goodman's enthusiastic re-creation of this perspective succeeds in resurrecting the civic paradigm's ambitious—though ultimately unsuccessful—Deweyan educational work, in turn exposing a profound underlying tension of that era over what radio was *for*.

Razlogova's inventive study, *The Listener's Voice*, picks up this theme, demonstrating that neither commercialization nor elite utopian fantasies completely won the day in radio's golden age, for contentious, feisty listeners prodded radio to respond to *their* values and tastes according to a shared "participatory ethic." Through diverse examples including soap operas, fan magazines, blackface, crime serials, and disc jockeys, Razlogova uses radio, intriguingly, as a lens onto a moral economy of reciprocity. Audiences were not mere commodities but critical participants in making radio's genres and social expectations. In a way, hers is the most anthropological of the recent radio histories, explicitly concerned with the agency of subaltern communities within the United States

in the 1920s–40s; moreover, in recovering these lost voices, *The Listener's Voice* shows the most originality in its use of sources.

Answering Gayatri Spivak's 1988 question "Can the subaltern speak?" in the multilingual affirmative is one of the primary tasks of Bessire and Fisher's *Radio Fields*. At first glance this volume might seem totally disconnected from histories of the US golden age of radio, since it is centered firmly in the digital age and in geographically dispersed locations like Nepal, Mexico, Mali, Israel, and Germany. However, the core questions that the essays explore share much with the work of US radio history scholars: What is the role of radio in emerging, modernizing democracies? How does radio constitute national identity, and how does it express and negotiate multiple subjectivities in relation to that national identity? Is access to radio inherently empowering? How are media ecologies generated, perpetuated, and contested on the ground (and in the air)? How are technologically mediated sound and the culturally specific language people use to talk about sound linked? By organizing their volume around the concept of radio fields (plural), the editors treat radio as unruly, not static, and deeply entangled with both inner life and political agency. Though each essay stands independently, the cumulative effect conveys that sound has a measurable social life and history (17) and that media and culture are mutually constitutive in a process accessed through examining radio's unique qualities, possibilities, and constraints (its media *affordances*, in other words) (20, 236).

In the United States, radio served two masters: the almighty dollar and the public good. The very wording of the 1927 Radio Act (which remains, still, the basis of all media broadcasting in the United States) suggested a conceptual tangle: it mandated that radio should operate "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity," but American broadcasting was, nearly from its beginning, relentlessly commercial—hence, "free" because it operated not at official behest but in response to market forces. According to Goodman, this vaunted freedom should not obscure the underlying reality: the commercial system rested on government's restraint from further regulation, always threatened in times of war or if radio failed to present proper public service credentials (9). Stamm's account of how thoroughly print newspapers embraced radio broadcasting in the late 1920s and styled themselves convincingly as a desirable class of broadcasters illustrates just how fictive was a "right to broadcast." Simply, "broadcasting is a governmentally granted and revocable privilege," in which "not all can have a station" (45). How media corporations (rather than, say, nonprofits and educational organizations) eventually gained the lion's share of the US broadcasting market and built nationwide networks is every bit a study in constraint and conservative forces as of freedom and the

disruptive power of new media. In another example, Razlogova traces how radio fan magazines (big business in the 1930s) grew out of cheap pulp publishing and mediated between corporate radio's supposedly highbrow intentions and the daily reality of their program's sensationalized content and working-class audiences (55–69). These new radio histories show how not only regulators but audiences themselves fetter broadcasters' supposed freedom in multiple, and often contradictory, ways.

One common thread through all these works is the relationship among radio, democracy, and the national imaginary.⁴ To the anthropologists in *Radio Fields*, “democracy” means several interconnected developments emerging in many postcolonial nations in the last two decades of the twentieth century, with consequences for radio broadcasting and culture. Describing Nepal in the mid-1990s, Laura Kenreuther enumerates the basic conditions of democracy: multiparty representational government, constitutional protections on speech and assembly, channels for expression by minority viewpoints, and dialogic media sustained by transparency and participation (in Bessire and Fisher 49). But when radio historians speak of “democracy” in the United States, especially in the 1930s, they tend to mean something both more cultural and less structural: broad-based civic engagement in the public sphere and a populist concern with the culture and lives of ordinary, everyday citizens. Radio's influence and reach in the 1930s was undeniable, but whether it enhanced or undermined democracy in those years is still a subject of much debate. The nation's capitalist foundations had been profoundly shaken; representative government itself appeared weak; and radio's power to either knit the nation together and revitalize the democratic project or divide the nation into warring factions gained sudden urgency.

A number of the studies note that the threat of mass communications to functioning democracy especially preoccupied pioneer radio researchers in the emerging field of communication and media studies in the 1930s. The Rockefeller Foundation Radio Project started work in 1937 at Princeton with the psychologists Hadley Cantril, Frank Stanton (then head of CBS's Research Department), and the Austrian émigré Paul Lazarsfeld, whose wife, Herta Herzog, also joined the research team. The project, funded by an initial \$67,000 grant over two years, aimed to find ways to study “the value of radio to listeners” (Goodman 230). It moved to Columbia in 1940 as the Office of Radio Research and evolved into the Bureau of Applied Social Research (Razlogova 101–2). As this trajectory implies, project leader Lazarsfeld's interest really lay in using radio research as a way to develop social research methodologies, especially opinion and market research measurement techniques—including

inventing the “Little Annie,” a human-emotion seismograph machine that recorded listeners’ preferences as they heard radio programs. The project also became, for a time, the North American research home for Frankfurt School critical theorists Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. Adorno in particular sharpened his contrarian critique of American mass culture on the whetstone of radio in published and unpublished works that have attracted renewed scholarly interest; his tortured ghost hovers over many of these new radio studies. Adorno and Lazarsfeld famously clashed over both method and theory; for example, Adorno’s studies of classical and popular music on radio led him to understand that audience response and desires were manufactured by-products of the commodification of popular culture, while Lazarsfeld believed that listener opinions were authentic and accessible to researchers through empirical methods (Goodman 166–70; Verma 122–23). Despite their differences, they shared the project’s commitment to examining how radio—the paradigmatic culture industry of their day—affected social adjustment, behavior, even cognition itself.

Fortuitously, on October 30, 1938, Orson Welles’s CBS Mercury Theatre on the Air production of *The War of the Worlds* provided the Princeton researchers an ideal test case for the impact of radio on mass audiences. The immediate context of the broadcast that fall was a rich stew of anxiety about the mounting crisis in Europe as well as a planned FCC investigation into whether radio networks constituted a dangerous monopoly—both of which drew fresh attention to radio’s potential power and the need for audiences to be critically engaged listeners, not passive, gullible ones. The first half of the radio play generated discernible panic at the time, especially along the eastern seaboard (though the panic has often been exaggerated in the retelling, it must be said), and a vitriolic blame game after the fact.

Verma reconsiders *The War of the Worlds* broadcast’s aesthetics and form, noting that the opening minutes establish no singular character for the listener to identify with and therefore no anchoring “audioposition” from which the program supposedly originates. It thus violates the common tropes of radio drama of its time; collapsing scene and duration leaves listeners disoriented. The action, he writes, “seems to culminate by aggregating”—happening all at once across several disconnected locations, linked only by the (both fictive and real) studio transmission, while the listener must “track many characters with little certainty of who is most important or even still alive.” Unlike the news or even news documentary programs of the era like *March of Time*, in Welles’s play “no voice speaks in all scenes, no place contains all effects, and no person frames the horizon of the fiction.” It does not merely imitate the

news flash; *War of the Worlds* piles voices, locations, and even entire program categories in confusion and rapid interruption—an “aesthetic of perpetual interjection,” adopting apocalyptic form for an apocalyptic tale. Radio itself devolves into some of broadcasting’s most haunting moments, as we eavesdrop on an unanswered shortwave operator calling out “isn’t there anyone on the air?” from a rooftop out over an empty, curiously silent city. By midhour, “the tale abandons us right where we really are, huddled beside a radiophonic life force dying before our very ears,” in Verma’s evocative words. In contrast, the program’s second half returns to a familiar narrative style of radio drama as the professor sorts out the new dystopian landscape, a storyline even the most unschooled listener could not mistake for reality (65–72).

Goodman pinpoints the source of much of the criticism about the broadcast as a “failure of listening” rather than a failure of radio narrative and transmission of meaning. At the time, and especially in the aftermath, *The War of the Worlds* appeared “to offer direct evidence of the susceptibility of Americans to irrational behavior under the influence of radio, and hence the dangerousness of radio”—in large part because it was a radio play *about* radio listening (245–46). The play concerned “the attempted subjugation of mentally inferior beings by mentally superior ones. . . . the drama of the *War of the Worlds* story was centrally about intelligence and domination, [which] triggered a debate in American society that was full of eugenic interest in the place of the less intelligent without modern, mass-mediated society” (253). As a series, CBS’s Mercury Theatre on the Air had consciously aimed highbrow, adapting “great works” of literature to radio form, packaged “for an ‘intelligent’ audience” that would listen intently, “not distractedly” (258). Panicked listeners were unintelligent, so the thinking went, not only missing the first minutes’ introduction but, more worryingly, radio’s embedded lessons in how to listen. It was, Goodman concludes, a “distressingly undemocratic moment” (285).

CBS discarded the initial letters it received soon after the show, to the consternation of the Princeton Radio Project researchers at the time and media historians ever since, but some six hundred that were mailed to the FCC survive—40 percent endorsements and 60 percent protests—from which Goodman provides a glimpse of the class biases and consumerist assumptions of radio audiences (268–83). Many of the protest letters simplistically asserted that such a program “should not have been allowed” to air, thus assuming greater censorship powers than regulators actually possessed, and characterizing radio programming as something akin to patent medicine that should be properly labeled by some central authority. Cantril (who had been one of the founders of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis in New York in 1937) and Herzog

hastily designed and conducted 135 interviews with New Jersey residents upset by the broadcast to learn why their “critical ability” and “rationality” had been overwhelmed or malfunctioned, and published their findings in 1940 as *The Invasion from Mars: A Study in the Psychology of Panic*. The researchers—perhaps unsurprisingly, given their previous research on class and radio consumption—correlated nonpanickers’ higher socioeconomic status with greater rational ability and emotional stability, whereas the greater number of affected listeners exhibited lower-class “status anxiety” along with a worrying quality that Cantril awkwardly tagged as “susceptibility-to-suggestion-when-facing-a-dangerous-situation” (Verma 122).

The public debate over *The War of the Worlds* was but one episode in a long history of the “social life of sound” that connects to the experience of listening, to perception itself, and to what Bessire, drawing on the work of the ethnomusicologist Steven Feld,⁵ calls “acoustemologies”—or, ways of knowing about (and *knowing with*) sound (16–17, 212). Adorno observed that radio listening involves both presence and absence, remembering and forgetting: the “instrumental/material aspects of the radio apparatus (studio microphones, transmitters, receivers, electrical grids, etc.) are forgotten or repressed . . . [and] fade into the background” (Anderson Blanton paraphrasing Adorno, in Bessire and Fisher 225). In his study of Appalachian radio faith prayer, Anderson Blanton elaborates on Adorno’s point: “This inability to actively conceptualize the infrastructure of broadcasting, therefore, creates a sensation of actuality—that an unmediated voice is present in the space of listening directly addressing the listeners in his or her singularity” (in Bessire and Fisher 225). The irony is that radio voices are in fact highly mediated, and Verma provides some of the most imaginative new scholarship on this point in his detailed discussions of radio’s constructed dimensionality. In “flattening” four-dimensional sound (space and time) into a two-dimensional signal (radio wave and time), radio dramatists—and here we may include radio documentarians and news broadcasters just as easily—had to compress a quadrilateral world into one that, when mentally reconstituted on the other end of the signal, conveyed to listeners a convincing illusion of height, depth, and width. The technique was not mere verisimilitude or capturing reality with precision but rather artistry, using the technologies of sound production to create a theater in/of the mind using sound blocking, microphone type and placement, and studio surfaces (Verma 27). Radio “masks” itself—it is, in a way, the ultimate act of ventriloquism and voice-throwing. Broadcasting itself is not what it seems to be; the audio program projects an “outer voice of hidden interest” (147), designed not (merely) to entertain and inform but to deliver advertising

messages at opportune moments. Both Verma's and Razlogova's vivid descriptions of long-vanished radio genres, from crime reality shows to dramas about supernatural perception and bungled transmission to radio noir, affirm that part of radio's self-reflexive cultural work was cautionary: radio's hypnotic threat or democratic promise hinged on listeners' perception and ability to make sense of the voices heard in their minds.

This new wave of radio scholarship ultimately reminds us that radio did not die in the 1950s, nor really ever since, but has remained a key outpost of vast homogenizing media empires well into the Internet age. It has also emerged, paradoxically, as a realm for divisive cultural identity politics far outside the American mainstream. Serials—crime shows and soaps in particular—persisted on radio long after variety and anthology programs had migrated to television, providing an audio counterpart to Richard Hofstadter's paranoid political styles and, eventually in AM talk shows, a public space that galvanized the Right. What died in the 1950s, according to Verma, was not radio as a viable medium but only its use as an experimental venue for narrative and visualization. When we listen to old radio, often delivered through nostalgia-infused old-time radio websites or "mineralized" in audio archives, we can never really access the full world they were part of—the network system, the celebrity magazines, a public that had learned over long experience *how* to experience these programs as a mass audience. Radio dramas repackaged as commercial products (sold in CD collections or downloaded as MP3 files, for example), aren't really "radio" any more, although they leave radio-like traces in cultural memory.

Each of these historical works marks the end of radio's golden age with slightly different signposts. Goodman winds down his book with the staid white male civic paradigm's exemplars in the 1940s (the august members of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press) utterly baffled at what they termed "the Sinatra phenomenon"—a full decade ahead of Elvis Presley, frenzied girls fainting and shrieking in overheated herds at concert venues. The commissioners' collective failure to see what all the fuss was about becomes a parable: radio's civic educational role would be utterly eclipsed by the postwar juggernaut of popular music and youth culture, although its echoes could be heard in Newton Minow's jeremiad over television's "vast wasteland" and even in current rhetoric about the role of the Internet in civic life.⁶ Stamm notes a temporary surge of FCC regulatory activism during the 1960s and 1970s restricting cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcasting, now long vanished in the rearview mirror since the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Media diversity seems to be suffering a similar fate as biodiversity in the twenty-first century: consolidation means habitat loss for threatened media species; but Stamm also

sees reason for hope in citizen engagement around the issue of media diversity and spectrum allocation. The current move to open low-power FM (LPFM) station licenses for bidding may yet, in the United States, breathe new life into eclectic, local-minded, community-based radio. Razlogova's book delivers a thoughtful epilogue on how open-source software, media piracy, Wikileaks, and filesharing serve as the contemporary counterparts to the early "squatter stations" and media reciprocity expectations that characterized the 1920s to the 1940s. She sees today's "hacker ethic" as rehearsing an older impulse (a populist moral economy of media). Media is more than a technologized transmission of a culture's values; it is a reflection of the culture's animating social relations of power and, in the case of radio especially, a unique documentary record of the nation's "vernacular social imagination" (159, 6).

For the future, one hopes that radio scholarship and the study of acoustic cultures might become as creative in format as it currently seems to be in theory and method, breaking away from the textual monograph into more inventive modes of electronic publishing and digital representation. Two of these books (Razlogova's and Goodman's) begin to do this with tepid companion websites, which leave one longing for creatively designed multimedia web content that truly captures the feel of a historical soundscape in all its rich complexity. Whatever the future shape such scholarship might take, these works are encouraging signs that radio studies is broadening and becoming more theoretically grounded, making radio indispensable to understanding cultures since the human voice first went wireless.

Notes

1. The cultural turn reached radio history with Michele Hilmes, *Radio Voices: American Broadcasting, 1922–1952* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); and Susan Douglas, *Listening In: Radio and the American Imagination* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004). Since then, the field has grown considerably and expanded into related disciplines of media studies and critical cultural theory; see, e.g., John Durham Peters, *Speaking into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Bruce Lenthall, *Radio's America: The Great Depression and the Rise of Modern Mass Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Alexander Russo, *Points on the Dial: Golden Age Radio beyond the Networks* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Jason Loviglio, *Radio's Intimate Public: Network Broadcasting and Mass-Mediated Democracy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); and Steve J. Wurtzler, *Electric Sounds: Technological Change and the Rise of Corporate Mass Media, Film, and Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).
2. Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980).

3. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964); and Walter Ong, "The Shifting Sensorium," in *The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*, ed. David Howes (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 25–30.
4. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); and Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992).
5. Steven Feld, "Waterfalls of Song: An Acoustemology of Place Resounding in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea," in *Senses of Place*, ed. Steven Feld and Keith Basso (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 1996), 91–136.
6. Newton Minow, "Television and the Public Interest," speech to the National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, DC, May 9, 1961.

Queer Art of Failure (Duke University Press, 2011), and *Gaga Feminism: Sex, Gender, and the End of Normal* (Beacon Press, 2012). Halberstam has coedited a number of anthologies including *Posthuman Bodies*, with Ira Livingston (Indiana University Press, 1995), and a special issue of *Social Text*, with Jose Muñoz and David Eng, titled “What’s Queer about Queer Studies Now?” Halberstam is working on several projects including a book titled *The Wild*, on queer anarchy, performance and protest culture, the visual representation of anarchy, and the intersections between animality, the human, and the environment.

Tona Hangen

Tona Hangen is associate professor of nineteenth- and twentieth-century US history at Worcester State University. She is the author of *Redeeming the Dial: Radio, Religion, and Popular Culture in America* (University of North Carolina Press, 2002) and writes about American religious history and media studies. Her current book project explores religious dimensions of school desegregation in the South.

Jennifer Helgren

Jennifer Helgren is assistant professor of history at the University of the Pacific in Stockton, California. She is the coeditor of *Girlhood: A Global History* (Rutgers University Press, 2010) and is the author of several articles on US girlhood. She is researching gendered internationalism and youth culture after World War II.

Miranda Joseph

Miranda Joseph is associate professor of gender and women’s studies at the University of Arizona. She is the author of *Debt to Society: Accounting for Life under Capitalism* (University of Minnesota Press, 2014) and *Against the Romance of Community* (University of Minnesota Press, 2002).

Việt Lê

Việt Lê is an artist, writer, and curator (www.vietle.net). He has been published in *positions: asia critique*, *Crab Orchard Review*, *Amerasia Journal*, among other publications. His art and curatorial projects have been exhibited in Asia, Europe, and North America. Lê is currently assistant professor in the Visual Studies Program and the Visual and Critical Studies Graduate Program at the California College of the Arts.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.