Textual Practice

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rtpr20

Gertrude Stein's radio audience

Adam Frank

To cite this article: Adam Frank (2022) Gertrude Stein's radio audience, Textual Practice, 36:12, 2016-2037, DOI: 10.1080/0950236X.2022.2149109

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2022.2149109

Published online: 28 Nov 2022.

TEXTUAL PRACTICE
2022, VOL. 36, NO. 12, 2016–2037
https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2022.2149109

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Gertrude Stein's radio audience

Adam Frank

Department of English Language and Literatures, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

ABSTRACT
This essay interprets Gertrude Stein's 1934 interview on NBC radio and its surrounding historical archive to unfold a powerful phantasy about radio audience as it simultaneously connects Stein to a new mass audience and frees her from it. In this phantasy, radio audience becomes the state of listening itself which takes place in the protected space of the studio while broadcasting becomes analogous to writing. The essay then turns to Theodor Adorno's contemporaneous work on 'radio physiognomics' in order to analyse his attempt to separate radio from its social ideals and the uses to which it has been put, and to supplement Adorno's Kleinian–Ferenczian approach to introjection, or the interiorisation of the microphone and the studio both in production and reception.

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 27 September 2022; Accepted 15 November 2022

KEYWORDS Radio; Gertrude Stein; Theodor Adorno; Rudolf Arnheim; object relations theory

To begin with a brief meditation on this project's title *Radio Free Stein* which resonates politically, ironically in ways I cannot control but that are entirely appropriate to its subject and our contemporary moment. The *radio free* moniker refers in its first historical instance to a major CIA initiative to disseminate American free market ideologies to Cold War Europe and beyond. Founded in 1949 Radio Free Europe became a model for similarly named CIA-sponsored stations elsewhere, and since the 1970s under the umbrella Radio Liberty network continues to participate in global strategies to support the (oh-so-slowly waning) American empire. The title suits Gertrude Stein's embarrassingly unabashed patriotism, her proleptic embrace of the so-called American century as it expresses and realises the modern. At the same time, *radio free* has been taken up by liberationist efforts from all over the political spectrum, from US Civil Rights to Scottish nationalism to religious pirate radio, and broadly signifies a rejection of perceived authority that restricts the communication of ideas. This too suits Stein's project

CONTACT Adam Frank adafrank@mail.ubc.ca University of British Columbia, #397 - 1873 East Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z1, Canada

or legacy, for whatever her non-radical economic politics may have been (I'm thinking of her staunch fiscal conservatism), her distinctly radical writing and poetics gave and continue to give readers (especially queer and feminist readers) fundamental permission, in the Emersonian mode, to unburden ourselves of linguistic traditions and the authority of literary and cultural histories.

The complex irony of my project's title, however, is less a consequence of the word *free* and its intricate, near-impossible meanings than of its adjacence to *radio*, that archaic medium whose resurgence both as an object of study in radio studies and as a popular practice in podcasting may be an occasion for surprise. No doubt, inexpensive digital means for recording, editing, mixing, and disseminating sound have made independent audio productions like this one possible. But if I prefer to associate my sound work with *radio* rather than podcasting it is because of the historical rootedness and political connotations of the term. The *radio free* prefix evokes, fairly precisely, the idea of propaganda both in its more neutral definition as 'an organization, scheme, or movement for the propagation of a particular doctrine, practice, etc.' (*OED*) and its more common, tendentious meaning. Propaganda, as Mark Wollaeger has helped us to understand it, is crucially part of the twentieth-century information-media matrix in which modernist literature, in its concern with the autonomy of the aesthetic, should be understood. His study of British literature between 1900 and 1940 suggests that propaganda's current meaning emerged most powerfully and unavoidably in the global context of two world wars and the multiple means for disseminating deceptive information in the service of state-sponsored political causes.[1] This period precisely spans Stein's career and saw the emergence of wireless radio as a mass medium, one of the primary means for disseminating information in a variety of propaganda-like modes (advertising, boosterism, promotion, public relations). Stein's own experiences with radio, as we will see, fully supports Wollaeger's unfolding of the symbiotic relations between modernist literature and propaganda: 'through its real and imagined proximity to propaganda, modernism came to know what it was in contrast to what it definitely was not and must not become … Propaganda, in other words, is the alter ego of modernist distanciation'.[2]

It would appear that radio-style practices have reemerged, then, in the face of our contemporary (oh-so-late) modernist need to find sources of reliable information, trustworthy voices, and ways to assess what we hear. Podcasting's intimate lyricism seeks to ground listeners in individual perception but tends to gloss over institutional factors. I find the term *radio* more explicit: it offers a historical rubric for thinking about information flow and the near-structural role for promotion, bias, and agenda in the propagation of ideas. It makes remediation explicit as well. We experience such remediations constantly, radio, film, television, all the major twentieth-century

mediums located on a single twenty-first-century device we carry in our pockets or handbags, an astonishing intensification and convergence of institutional media as they structure and integrate perception, feeling, politics, and everyday life. These recent experiences are the condition for what has emerged in modernist literary studies as a near-consensus. Most contemporary scholars who study literature around and after 1900 consider it to (among other things) register, respond to, and be transformed by the accelerating relations among technologies of recording and communication. That is, they approach a broad media ecology in materialist terms that supplement an earlier emphasis on print and publishing institutions (the little magazines, say) with attention to multiple media. Conceptually, they are frequently informed by the media theory of Friedrich Kittler or, somewhat differently, by Marxist media studies, whether that of the Frankfurt School or of Raymond Williams.[3] Wollaeger's work on modernism and propaganda participates in this current consensus, and the subfield of radio studies can be located in this context as well.[4]

Radio Free Stein, in addressing Stein's theatre and poetics vis-à-vis radio, also participates in this consensus.[5] It does so, however, in two unusual ways. First, its interpretations of Stein's plays take the form of collaborative audio recordings or radio melodramas guided by these critical questions: What might a reader be able to think and say about Stein's plays after undergoing the process of staging them sonically? What new affordances for understanding and criticism would emerge from this experience? Second, and in keeping with this emphasis on experience, the project approaches Stein's theatre by way of affect and object relations theory and a particular focus on fantasy and feeling, what Melanie Klein and her followers describe in terms of the dynamics of unconscious phantasy. This conceptual approach builds on my previous work that brings Wilfred Bion's writing on reciprocal relations of psychic containment to Stein's landscape theatre poetics.[6] In the current work I pose several new questions: How do Stein's theatre poetics contain radio and its expressive techniques? How might radio contain Stein's poetics? And what might Stein's writing tell us about those phantasies that accompany the ubiquitous technological reproduction of sound images in the ongoing modernist moment?

The pages that follow turn to materials associated with Stein's 1934 radio interview, which include an audio recording, a script prepared in advance of the broadcast, and a magazine article that Stein wrote at the time. In the latter, Stein articulates a powerful phantasy about *radio audience* that both connects her to a new audience and simultaneously frees her from it via the protective space of the studio. In other words, radio frees Stein from the audience precisely because radio frees Stein to audience as the act of hearing itself. The essay then turns to Theodor Adorno's writings on radio which help to ground my methodological approach insofar as they bring

social, technical, and aesthetic considerations together in pursuit of what he calls radio physiognomics. Adorno's focus on the listener and the interiority of reception is helpful but, I propose, can be supplemented with analysis of the space of production, specifically the microphone and the studio, those technologies interiorised in experiences of listening to radio. The essay concludes with a few remarks about Stein's plays as they summon into our awareness the space of production, composition, or writing.

If the *Radio Free Stein* project has embraced the task of propagating Stein's reflexive theatre, it is with a Spinozist cheerfulness, an awareness that her theatre is, to cite Walter Benjamin's famous phrase with a slight twist, utterly useless for the purposes of propaganda (for better and for worse). Unlike propaganda's efforts to overwhelm and confuse or to deceptively clarify, or both, Stein's plays offer opportunities for thinking precisely about the intimate relations between clarity and confusion. Put differently, Stein's writing attends to the epistemic value of feeling, especially the feeling of enjoyment which she proposes in her radio interview as an alternative to more cognitive epistemic styles (such as summary and paraphrase). To prioritise feeling is not at all to subordinate thinking, not in the pragmatist tradition to which Stein belongs.[7] Rather, Stein's theatre amplifies the corporeality of thinking and what John Durham Peters has identified as the erotic uncanniness of those tele-technologies that communicate at a distance: 'Not the ghost in the machine, but the body in the medium is the central dilemma of modern communication'.[8] This is also the central concern of writing as such, at least from the perspective of Stein's radically empiricist poetics. My approach here shares with Peters a sense of the theoretical stakes of communication, as he puts it in his overview of philosophical thinking on the topic in the 1920s and 1930s: 'The task today [] is to renounce the dream of communication while retaining the goods it invokes … to find an account of communication that erases neither the curious fact of otherness at its core nor the possibility of doing things with words', and his preferred path is by way of 'a pragmatism open to both the uncanny and the practical'.[9] This is the approach I take here, an approach that Stein herself appears to take in her radio interview. I turn to that broadcast now.

* * * * *

The evening of 12th November 1934 NBC reporter William Lundell conducted an interview with Gertrude Stein in a New York radio studio that was broadcast live and distributed coast-to-coast.[10] Both Stein and Lundell read from a script they had prepared two days earlier and, it appears, revised just prior to the broadcast.[11] While the seasoned broadcaster improvised lightly to create the effect of spontaneity (adding 'Well' or 'Miss Stein' here and there), Stein kept close to the script. Until, that is, about halfway

through the interview when she began, like Lundell, to play a little more freely with the words on the page and to engage with the emotional dynamics of the interview situation. Lundell, director of special events programmes at NBC ('the first man to do an interview from earth to airplane in 1929'),[12] was friendly but reserved, and combined an ironic appreciation of Stein's remarkable celebrity at the start of her United States lecture tour with a genuine curiosity about her writing as well as scepticism about its reception. When his scepticism becomes more confrontational Stein goes ever-so-slightly off-script to address her interviewer directly in her best bluff, patronising manner ('Well, you see Lundell'). Energised by the tension and Stein's wish to get her ideas across, the interview warms up and sounds more like conversation. While both remain on script, they do seem to be listening to one another.

In preparing a written script and then improvising from it Lundell and Stein were pursuing standard radio practice of the time. As the early theorist of radio Rudolf Arnheim explains, 'In broadcasting to-day it is customary to read from a paper what one wants to say to the listener'.[13] In his chapter 'The Art of Speaking to Everybody' Arnheim assesses this practice, moving skilfully through a set of dialectics (direct and indirect address, composition in speech and in writing) while he explores how best to deliver expert knowledge. Given the 'double function of language' as medium of information and expression, the nature of listener attention, and the intimidating need to deliver high-quality broadcasting to 'the huge radio-audience', Arnheim ultimately commends the practice of preparing a script and then formulating expression as if for the first time:

> So, when one is drafting out a wireless talk, one must consciously include in the script the personal tone of voice and way of speaking, quite indifferent as to whether the resultant 'score' of the talk makes at the same time a good piece of printed literature or not.[14]

By analogy with the performance of scored music, Arnheim implies, radio should be carefully composed and then performed with attentive spontaneity.

Lundell and his colleagues knew what they were doing, and Stein could not have been more pleased. As she put it in a piece for *Hearst's International-Cosmopolitan Magazine* that describes her new encounters and experiences in the United States, 'of all the things that I never did before, perhaps I like this the best'.[15] Stein liked radio broadcasting for a number of related reasons, first and foremost because it cultivated the powerful feeling that 'everybody was listening' and so offered her access to a large, if necessarily conjectural audience.[16] At the same time, and relatedly, radio opened an auditory space of unconscious phantasy that suits Stein's writing (especially her playwriting) and poetics. Radio in the 1930s could

do these things insofar as it staged the performance of reading, that is, insofar as it theatricalised the seemingly personal, individuated, intimate event of reading itself.

Of course, as an aural stage for the performance of reading radio resembled that other venue for writerly performance, the poetry reading. In both poetic declamation and radio performance vocal intonation and physiognomy are foregrounded. Arnheim's description of reading in front of a microphone aptly describes Stein's recitation, toward the end of the interview, of an excerpt from her portrait of Carl Van Vechten: 'Much that, if it were read [silently], would seem clumsy or liable to misunderstanding[,] at the microphone, makes a vivid and personal impression because of the special cadence and emphasis given to it by the speaker'.[17] Cadence and emphasis were Stein's specialty. As one journalist attending her lectures put it,

> To hear Miss Stein read her own work is to understand it – I speak for myself – for the first time … [Y]ou see how from sentence to sentence, which seem so much alike, she introduces differences of tone, or perhaps of accent. And then when you think she has been saying the same thing four or five times you suddenly know that she has carefully, link by link, been leading you to a new thing.[18]

While Stein's recitation of the Van Vechten portrait subtly evokes declamatory style, it is more continuous than not with the speech patterns of the interview and its rapid repartee. In fact the portrait excerpt, transcribed into the script, becomes part of the radio dialogue itself. In the context of reading aloud from a script on radio there is little contrast or differentiation between poetic and theatrical performance. To put this another way, the medium of radio (and the vocal techniques that accompanied it in the 1930s) exerted new pressures on literary genres as well as on the relations between literary and musical composition. Consider the remarkable prevalence of verse radio drama and return to ancient Greek dramatic models (the announcer as chorus, for example). Milton Kaplan observes in his book *Radio and Poetry* (1949) that writers of radio verse (Norman Corwin the prime example) can best be thought of as orchestrators of words and sounds.[19] Once again, as with Arnheim's radio-script-as-score, we have a musical analogy for verbal radio art. Stein's writing exerts a pressure similar to the medium of radio: her plays require readers to orchestrate various parts in order to stage the performance of reading.[20]

One major context for the theatricality of radio voices in general, and of this interview in particular, is the stage of celebrity.[21] Stein and Toklas had stepped off the boat from Paris (the *S.S. Champlain*) three weeks before the radio interview and had already been filmed in a Pathé newsreel, flown to Chicago to attend the opening night of *Four Saints in Three Acts*, and

Stein had given the first lectures of her six-month lecture tour.[22] That is, they had landed in the middle of mass American culture and its publicity machines and were rapidly developing an awareness of a much larger and more varied audience for Stein's writing than ever before. The article for *Cosmopolitan*, titled 'I Came and Here I Am', is her first published attempt to think through the whirlwind of exciting and unsettling experiences that accompanied her successful emergence, at the age of 60, as an author on the American scene. As its unusually breathless tone attests, Stein had not yet brought to these experiences the careful, sustained, remarkable attention that characterises her more usual meditative writing. Nevertheless, the article offers useful context for her radio interview, for Stein appears to have completed it after returning to her hotel the night of the broadcast ('Tonight I did the last thing that I never did before').[23]

Illustrated with photographs captioned by Stein's aperçus the article is a primer on the technologies and media of modernism: sound film, airplanes, skyscrapers, traffic lights, and radio. Stein emphasises the novelty and strangeness of her encounters even while she tries to contextualise them in more familiar terms. In comparing airplane flight with boat travel we hear her reflexive attention to contrasting media: 'why did nobody tell me before I got on that the air is solid. Of course it is solid, it is just as solid as water'.[24] She describes one effect of her celebrity, strangers recognising her on the streets of New York City (yet another medium), this way: 'It is just like living in the country where I live and there are very few people and where I know anybody and everybody knows me'.[25] In the radio interview Stein is more forthright about her fear ('I who am easily frightened by anything unexpected find this spontaneous considerate contact with all and any New York touching and pleasing') but in both article and interview she describes 'the gentle pleasant unreality of it', of the streets, buildings, and people.[26] The strange yet natural space of the public is, at the same time, an 'unreality', a space of phantasy that she hopes will accommodate the frightening aspects of her new experiences.

Stein expresses concern that the new regimes of publicity will threaten her perceptual orientation and compositional agency. Consider her comparison between seeing herself in a short newsreel to 'unexpectedly seeing one's name in print' with its 'slightly mixed-up feeling, are you or are you not one'.[27] The feeling of self-estrangement and multiplicity is significantly amplified by film:

> imagine what is that [i.e. the confusion of seeing your name in print] compared to never having heard anybody's voice speaking while a picture is doing something, and that voice and that person is yourself, if you could really and truly be that one. It upset me very much when that happened to me.[28]

In observing sound film's capacity to reproduce images of the voice and 'person' (body and face), Stein registers a further disturbance to perception (as Roland Barthes famously describes photography) that accompanies cinematographic technologies: the novelty of hearing and seeing oneself speaking and moving from the outside, from the uncanny perspective of another and the mixing-up of pronouns ('one' and 'me') that results.[29] The same technologically conditioned experiences that disturbed Stein's perceptual self-orientation were the condition for her celebrity, the much-sought-after celebrity that would threaten her carefully calibrated separation of inside from outside. These confusions and dissociations preoccupied Stein for years and troubled (at least, for a while) her compositional agency and knowledge practices.

Radio, however, was different. Stein compares her broadcasting experience, not to the disturbing publicity of print but to the practice of writing itself. Rather than confuse inside and outside as film did, radio permitted her to maintain a distinction that she believed to be crucial to her writing: 'I write for myself and strangers and this is what broadcasting is. I write for myself and strangers'.[30] This formulation, a refrain from her long novel *The Making of Americans* completed almost 25 years before and published (in abridged form) by Harcourt Brace in spring 1934, identifies radio as the culmination of the long arc of Stein's career. Radio offered Stein positive answers to her most pressing questions: Will there be an audience for my writing? What will it be like? How might I come to know, or become acquainted with, this audience? She had represented these worries to herself very clearly in a piece written in September just before leaving France, 'Meditations on Being About to Visit My Native Land', in which she was concerned about the behaviour of her imagined lecture audiences: 'Will they ask me questions and will I ask them questions and which will ask the questions most and first, and will they listen to me and will I listen to them'.[31] These concerns, significant for any writer acceding to a new order of publicity, become crucial given Stein's commitment to what she describes elsewhere as 'talking and listening at the same time' which is, she claims, the 'essence of genius'.[32]

In the context of these worries broadcasting offered Stein clear comforts. The question-and-answer format of the radio interview and the fact that it was scripted in advance were reassuring: 'And then we went into training. I liked that; I wrote out answers to questions and questions to answers and I liked that'.[33] She notes with pleased surprise that what she reads aloud sounds, even to her, like improvised speech ('it was, it really was, as if you were saying what you were saying') and she is impressed by the efficient, exacting temporal coordination of a live broadcast ('they were going to time us and they did … they knew so well how to do this thing and no fuss was made about anything').[34] Most important, what emerges

from these experiences of radio broadcasting that so exhilarated Stein is a specific fantasy about radio audience. Consider this description:

> Then we sat down one on either side of the little thing that was between us and I said something and they said that is all, and then suddenly it was all going on. It was it was really all going on, and it was, it really was, as if you were saying what you were saying and you knew, you really knew, not by what you knew but by what you felt, that everybody was listening. It is a very wonderful thing to do, I almost stopped and said it, I was so filled with it. And then it was over and I never had liked anything as I had liked it.[35]

Radio's basic fantasy, 'everybody was listening', condenses two meanings: *the audience* in the more usual sense of an assembly or 'a body of hearers, spectators' and *audience* in the somewhat less usual sense of 'the action or scope of hearing' (*OED*). There was an assembly of people at the studio watching and listening to Stein and Lundell (including Toklas, the publisher Bennet Cerf who arranged the radio event, the actress Miriam Hopkins, journalists, photographers, sound engineers, possibly others), that is, a small studio audience, but Stein's attention is elsewhere: 'and then I was taken into another room and there were more people but by that time I was not noticing much of anything'.[36] In her excitement and fear she concentrates on reading from the script, on talking and reflexively listening to her own speech and Lundell's. For Stein, audience took place regardless of whether anyone other than herself was actually listening.

To put this another way, radio freed Stein from *the audience* by making *audience* available as a feeling: 'you really knew, not by what you knew but by what you felt, that everybody was listening'. This is a fantasy in Freud's sense, an expression of a writerly wish (or hallucination) for the greatest possible number of listeners. But it is also a phantasy in Melanie Klein's sense, an unconscious idea of the inside of the (mother's) body. Consider that all the important locations in Stein's story about radio are interior: 'there were so many rooms and all the rooms were empty rooms, that was all right; and then all of a sudden we were in a little room … and then I was taken into another room'.[37] In the studio the 'little thing' that looks like a kind of dildo or vibrator but acts like an ear and that gave her a wonderful feeling of being 'so filled with it' lets Stein introject (in phantasy) the microphone as audience. Once inside this feeling of audience can become available to thinking, meditation and, eventually, a resource for writing.

To be clear, I am not identifying Stein's feeling of audience as a phantasy of penetration and thereby enacting critical (heterosexual, classical Freudian) mastery over her. Rather, from a queer Kleinian perspective the microphone, that little thing, is a part-object that is introjected to facilitate oral transmission and aural receptiveness. (Robert Ashley's 1964 composition *The Wolfman*, for performer, microphone, and amplification system, offers a

sonic literalization of this phantasy of introjection.) Moving between an analysis of (conscious) fantasy and (unconscious) phantasy, I am trying to understand the affective conditions that mediate production and reception, both in the space of the studio and at home for the listener. In a sense I am crossing methodological wires in radio studies where there has been a tendency to approach questions of reception from a phenomenological perspective and questions of production from a historicist one. Fantasy and phantasy are present in both production and reception. The scene of Stein's radio interview leads me to wonder how the phenomenology of transmission (studio broadcasting, in this case) affects the receiver.

So here's a somewhat historical point: If in her radio broadcast Stein imagines that she is speaking to the audience of strangers that is not present, she is also, at the same time, speaking to those who are. And it helped that the studio audience enjoyed the performance. When Bennet Cerf, her publisher at Random House, introduced her to the audience this way – 'I'm very proud to be your publisher, Miss Stein, but as I've always told you, I don't understand very much of what you're saying' – she immediately replied, 'Well, I've always told you, Bennett, you're a very nice boy but you're rather stupid'.[38] Banter with her publisher becomes entertainment for the studio audience who 'let out a howl' of laughter.[39] In asserting that Stein 'was the publicity hound of the world – simply great; she could have been a tremendous hit in show business', Cerf was noticing Stein's wit and laser-like address to specific others.[40] In fact, despite her oft-repeated claim to write for herself and for strangers it should be acknowledged how much Stein actually depended on people she knew and loved to form her readership. Early in her career she wrote for her brother Leo, later for Alice Toklas, and always for friends, acquaintances, and portrait subjects. In *Everybody's Autobiography* she describes a conversation with several Hollywood actors and directors this way: 'they wanted to know how I had succeeded in getting so much publicity, I said by having a small audience'.[41]

And here's a more phenomenological observation: Stein's nuanced play with address suits radio perfectly, for what accompanies its interiorising phantasy of audience and universal access is its actual address to specific groups of listeners. In the 1930s radio's movement across a range of spaces of address (between one and everyone) is conditioned by many things including the listener's ethnic, class, and linguistic status vis-à-vis the broadcaster, but also by her geographical proximity to the broadcasting source as well as spatial proximity to the radio set in its location in the home or elsewhere. But I would suggest that the situation of the performer in front of the microphone is at least as important for what is most often described as the intimacy of radio address. Insofar as the microphone in studio broadcasting is quite close to the sound source a listener experiences radio vocalisation to be closer than voices in ordinary conversation (the visual analogy is a film

close-up). A radio performer's physiology may be absent, but subtle traces of his or her breathing, the movements of a mouth or played instrument brush up against our eardrums at once intimately close and entirely apart from us. The performer's phantasised introjection of the microphone becomes the listener's: vocal introjection becomes audience.

It is not clear to me whether Stein ever heard a recording of the NBC broadcast, a recording probably made at Cerf's request. She did hear recordings of her own voice in recitations made at Columbia University and at Erpi Studios in New York City for the National Council of Teachers of English, but I have not found any description of her responses to hearing her recorded voice.[42] The experiences with radio I am discussing were primarily from the perspective of production or transmission, not reception. I suggest that Stein's particular exhilaration, her identification of broadcasting with writing itself, evokes radio's basic phantasmatic structure of address as it gratifies a writerly wish: to enjoy communion with an audience while being alone and protected from it. This powerful wish could almost be realised at the microphone in the studio (etymologically, the artist's or scholar's workroom, a private space for reverie, a *study*) but only by disavowing the actual presence of a studio audience.[43]

Stein had good reason to find these protective aspects of radio helpful as she introduced her radically queer and experimental writing to potentially hostile audiences. There are several moments in the radio interview when Lundell questions Stein about the opacity and estranging materiality of her writing. In one famous exchange she replies to his question about the intelligibility of her opera *Four Saints in Three Acts* this way:

> Look here, being intelligible is not what it seems. […] After all when you say that they do not understand FOUR SAINTS what do you mean. You mean by understanding that you can talk about it in the way that you have a habit of talking … putting it in other words … but I mean by understanding enjoyment. If you enjoy it, you understand it, and lots of people have enjoyed it so lots of people have understood it.[44]

Stein's insistence on enjoyment as a mark of understanding, here and elsewhere in the interview, is not simply defensive. It is her way of describing in highly compressed form her radically empiricist poetics. For Stein (as for William James) understanding is located in a reflexive, affective, near-physiological awareness of the present-tense nature of experience. She expresses these poetics most succinctly a little later:

> And you must not think that you do not understand because you cannot say it to yourself in other words. If you have something happen in you when you read these portraits you do understand no matter what you say to yourself and others about not understanding. Really and truly that is really and truly true.[45]

Stein utters and insists, exemplifies and enacts the repetition-with-a-difference that plays such a key role in her poetics. The specific difference here, and what occasions this unusually clear insistence, is radio.

* * * * *

But why is it radio that elicits such a clear expression of Stein's poetics? What difference does radio make anyway? This is the question that guides Theodor Adorno's writings on radio. More specifically, as Martin Harries and Lecia Rosenthal suggest, Adorno's question is: what difference does radio make to the situation of aesthetic reception?[46] As Harries and Rosenthal understand it Adorno's analysis of radio's artifice and immediacy, its mechanisation of sound and spatial ubiquity, offers a materialist revision of Kantian aesthetics: 'Radio becomes, in its uneven development, a fact of the situation of the traditional arts'.[47] In this section I will be oriented by the more Benjaminian aspects of Adorno's long, multi-faceted excursion into radio and especially by those moments when he turns to psychoanalytic writing to support his method. I seek not only to contextualise and authorise the Kleinian approach to phantasy I have taken above but also (and more substantively) to supplement Adorno's phenomenological analysis of the situation of the listener. This situation, as I have suggested with regard to Gertrude Stein's radio experience, depends upon that of the producer or transmitter, the voice that (in the 1930s) reads aloud in front of the microphone (and this includes the phonograph voice, the playback of music on the radio). This radio voice introjects (in phantasy) the microphone and the protective space of the studio to form an interiorised, theatrical space of reading. The difference radio makes to the situation of reception, then, is a function of introjected audience: the radio voice already contains the phantasised listener whose ear contains the studio.

Adorno describes the radio voice this way: 'Radio "speaks to us" even when we are not listening to a speaker. It might grimace; it might shock us; it might even "raise its eyes"'.[48] Such terms signal his unusual approach to radio physiognomics, '*the study of the elements of expression of the "radio voice"*'.[49] Adorno understands the provocation involved in calling his method physiognomic given the status of this obsolete concept in twentieth-century psychology. Nevertheless he finds something valuable in this method insofar as 'the phenomena we are studying constitute a unity comparable to that of a human face' (p. 44). In seeking to address, not a given singer's expression or a commentator's intonations, but 'the way any voice or any instrumental sound is presented over the radio' (p. 44), radio physiognomy solicits a phenomenological approach to the affective or emotional transactions that take place between radio and listener, transactions that are, Adorno claims, comparable to those between persons spatially co-present:

> To render it in psychological terms: in the experience of live voices and faces the phenomenon is not merely a superficial sign of whatever is behind it, replaceable by another sign. It constitutes a unity with the content that is its expression. The specific characteristics of the radio voice, such as the 'illusion of closeness', tend in the same way to such an expression which is more than a contingent set of signs. (p. 373)

Adorno investigates the expressiveness of the radio voice (its indexicality) in order to discover the particular authenticity of the radio instrument.

I have been quoting from *Current of Music* (2009), a reconstruction of a volume that Adorno proposed but never published in his lifetime that consists of the writing he completed while working on the Princeton Radio Project ('Adorno's most extensive work in English' (p. 4), according to the editor). Adorno had arrived in New York City the winter of 1938 (on the *S.S. Champlain*, like Stein four years earlier) to join Max Horkheimer at the Institute for Social Research (then at Columbia University) and to begin working on a study of American radio supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and directed by Paul Lazarsfeld. Lazarsfeld, a University of Vienna trained mathematician and psychologist who had arrived in the United States five years earlier, was quickly becoming 'the father of market research in America', according to the radio historian Susan Douglas.[50] Lazarsfeld had immersed himself in the new field of American social psychology and brought university based methods (large-scale sociological surveys and quantitative studies) together with the aims of advertising and corporate communications research. Needless to say, Adorno's conceptual phenomenology contrasted sharply with Lazarsfeld's narrow empiricism and demographic goals of determining what programmes which people were listening to when. Adorno described these goals as concerned with the 'what' elements of radio whereas he pursued its 'how' elements, ordinarily only of interest to radio engineers, technicians, and aesthetes. The specific qualities of radio sound, what Adorno insists on calling the *radio voice*, is his physiognomic topic of investigation.

Brian Kane has offered a careful reconstruction of the intellectual contexts for these radio writings.[51] He observes the provenance of the *what/how* distinction in Edmund Husserl and proposes that, while Adorno critiqued Husserl's phenomenology as idealist, he nevertheless mobilised it against the empiricism of the social psychologists, in particular that of his colleague at the Princeton Radio Project, Hadley Cantril who, with Gordon Allport, had developed a concept of the radio voice in *The Psychology of Radio* (1935). For Adorno the radio voice is no longer, as it is for Cantril and Allport, the voice on the radio, but the voice of the radio itself (p. 99). 'In Adorno's use of the what and the how', argues Kane, 'we see him pressing phenomenology into dialectical use' (p. 100), physiognomics the name of an immanently transformed phenomenology developed as a robust form

of social critique, at once psychological, technical and political. Adorno's notion of physiognomics also emerged from his encounters with psychoanalytic writings. While this observation by no means contradicts Kane's argument (Freud's relation to phenomenology, especially through the teaching and work of Franz Brentano, is a complicated story in itself), it is meant to reorient his approach to Adorno's concept of phantasmagoria: 'by exposing the phantasmagoric aspects of the radio voice, Adorno moves beyond the supposed immediacy of the radio voice toward the articulation of the radio phenomenon as an expression of social forces' (p. 107). But Adorno never really 'moves beyond' radio's immediacy or closeness in his analysis of social forces, for what is left out of Kane's discussion is the difference between phantasmagoria (which, he suggests, Adorno defines as 'the occultation of the means of production' (p. 94)) and phantasy. Radio requires physiognomic analysis precisely because it elicits phantasmatic (psychical, somatic) responses, phantasies that are fundamental but can nevertheless be separated (with difficulty) from their phantasmagorical or occulted elaborations. Phantasy is not the same as phantasmagoria in that phantasy cannot be dispelled.

Adorno's physiognomic analysis begins with what has become a commonplace in discussions of radio, 'the illusion of closeness', a phrase (borrowed from studies of the role of radio in children's education) that names the peculiar intimacy of radio listening: the instrument appears to 'speak for itself' despite the fact that 'it merely distributes the voices of other speaking people' (p. 46). This illusion, Adorno claims, is due to the physical situation of the listener 'who directly faces the apparatus instead of the man [*sic*] who is playing or speaking. Thus the visible tool becomes the bearer and the impersonation of the sound whose origin is invisible' (p. 47). According to Adorno this impersonation and radio's proximity interfere with the listener's contact with reality. With reference to Orson Welles' infamous broadcast of *The War of the Worlds* (in October 1938) Adorno proposes that the illusion of closeness establishes the authority of the radio voice, making it seem 'more objective and infallible than a live voice' (p. 47), even reaching into 'atavistic layers of our psychic life' (p. 47). In a conceptual moment that anticipates Marshall McLuhan's writing, Adorno observes the 'analogy between the technical structure of the microphone and the ear' (p. 48) and considers how 'the radio mechanism is a sort of mechanization of human sense organs' (p. 48) that offers prosthetic substitutes for the voice and the ear. In this way Adorno justifies physiognomics as a method for analysing the mechanised, authoritative, intimate, and highly effective radio voice.

Clearly, for Adorno, no small part of the radio voice's effectiveness is due to its unconscious reach: 'One of the guiding principles of the physiognomic approach is our conviction of the importance of [] unconscious elements of

the radio "phenomenon"' (p. 48). In a long footnote in his essay 'The Radio Voice', a footnote that is later moved (in lightly revised form) into the body of his writing, Adorno refers to the work of two psychoanalysts, Siegfried Bernfeld and Sandor Ferenczi, specifically to Bernfeld's explicit discussion of 'The "physiognomics" of individual organs of the human body' (p. 372, note). Bernfeld, mostly known now for his work on education and Freud's scientific training, was drawn in the mid-1930s to Ferenczi's bioanalysis with its understanding of bodily organs invested with psychic meaning.[52] As Elizabeth Wilson has suggested, one significant aspect of the conflict between Ferenczi and Freud pertained to different kinds of biological commitments: Freud the neuroanatomist emphasised the brain as the important location of whatever biological events underlay psychic phenomena, whereas Ferenczi insisted that other bodily locations (peripheral, organic) act independently and even 'speak' to one another without necessarily communicating only through the central nervous system.[53] Melanie Klein, whose first analysis was with Ferenczi, developed her difficult concept of unconscious phantasy out of this perspective and like Ferenczi was oriented toward a speculative organic ground for psychical phenomena:

> Unconscious phantasies underlie every mental process, and accompany all mental activity. They are the mental representation of those somatic events in the body which comprise the instincts, and are physical sensations interpreted as relationships with objects that cause those sensations.[54]

This definition glimpses at the Ferenczian possibility that 'mental activity' need not only and always refer to brain activity. For Klein, to use a Steinian double negative, mind is *not* not body.

In this context Adorno proposes a curious analogy: 'in the case of an organ of society such as the radio, the idea of its appearing as something independent and self-styled and speaking for itself is certainly no less appropriate than in cases of biological functions' (p. 372). His physiognomic approach appears to be indebted to a more Ferenczian, less top-down or brain-centered view. (Indeed, the history of technology that emerges from these radio writings resembles that of Raymond Williams in its rejection of linear determinism, although unlike Williams it also rejects intention: 'It would be fallacious and a bad simplification [] to say that radio is a product of monopoly capitalism … The tendencies which associate it with the present social conditions have nothing to do with the consciousness of the originators of radio. These tendencies are being realized over their heads' (p. 94 fn).) Although at no point does he use the term explicitly, Adorno's physiognomic approach to radio evokes the dynamics of phantasy insofar as it seeks to discover how a listener's sensory experiences are interpreted by way of unconscious relationships with the object (the radio). John Mowitt notes in his discussion of Adorno that radio's illusion of closeness 'is

clearly more than proximity: it is about a feeling that sound, amplified noise, is penetrating, breaking into something or someone who can face a wireless'.[55] Again, from a Kleinian perspective, the relevant phantasy is less penetration (projection) than a doubled introjection: the listener's introjection of the speaker's introjection of the microphone.

It is in his discussion of broadcast music that Adorno most powerfully analyses these aspects of radio experience. We have repeatedly encountered the role that music plays in discussions of radio speech in the 1930s: radio's words are consistently cast as dependent on or guided by musical *techne* (scores, orchestrations). Broadcasting, it appeared to early radio theorists, emphasised the sonic quality of spoken words which rendered them both contiguous and continuous with musical sounds (here Arnheim's discussion of 'the acoustic bridge' (p. 195) is most relevant). This focus on music emerged from an encounter between inheritors of nineteenth-century German aesthetic theory (like Adorno and Arnheim) and sound reproduction. The aesthetic hierarchy in which so-called pure, or non-representational, instrumental music tops the arts becomes untenable when phonograph and radio make salient both the coded and inscriptive qualities of recorded and broadcast music, its material status as sonic signal and writing. My focus here, as I turn briefly and selectively to Adorno's discussion of symphonic music in his radio writings, is the question of the authority that accompanies the interiorisation of broadcast sound and especially music.

Adorno describes the sound of a symphony broadcast over a loud radio in a small room in physiognomic terms, as 'aggressive, barking and bellowing' (p. 53), with 'something of the vagueness and lack of clarity of bad photographic enlargements' (p. 53). With the volume turned down on the 1930s radio set, key aspects of a symphony's dynamic range are lost. In Adorno's example, the opening bars of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony lose their meaning and intensity in 'the acoustic conditions of a private room' (p. 54). More generally, he observes, symphonic music becomes '"bad" chamber music' (p. 54) over the radio. But Adorno is not necessarily seeking to valorise the original or live presentation of music over its radio reproduction. In fact, he considers that 'The stubborn condemnation of mechanically reproduced music would deprive it of possibilities which … should be developed and improved with the help of criticism instead of being rejected for the sake of the sanctity of the work of art' (p. 59). Adorno is clearly informed by his friend and colleague Walter Benjamin's writing on photography and film, the contingent, historical relations between specific technologies and modes of perception, and brings them to radio and sound reproduction. According to Adorno, radio encourages 'sensuous listening' over 'structural listening', that is, 'a sharpening of attention upon the parts' (p. 64), an attention to musical texture, nuance, and detail rather than to compositional structure or form. For Adorno, all

music broadcast over radio becomes chamber or parlour music, oriented toward private or interior spaces.

In the section on method that follows his discussion of symphonic music Adorno brings his conclusions about the reproduced nature of the (musical) radio voice to an explicitly political critique. 'How must we understand the "expression" of the "radio voice" as an index?' (p. 69), asks Adorno, and his answer is that the radio voice points to 'something fundamental about radio itself, namely that a private person in a private room is privately addressed by a public voice to which he is forced to subordinate himself' (p. 70). In other words, the authority of the radio voice derives from its interiorising nature, its chamber or parlour aspect:

> When a private person in a private room is subjected to a public utility mediated by a loudspeaker, his response takes on aspects of a response to an authoritarian voice even if the content of that voice or the speaker to whom the individual is listening has no authoritarian features whatsoever. (p. 70)

'The authority of radio becomes greater the more it addresses the listener in his privacy', insists Adorno, and offers this remarkable image of how the listener's body and domestic objects appear to become the source of the radio voice:

> The deeper this voice is involved within his own privacy, the more it appears to pour out of the cells of his most intimate life; the more he gets the impression that his own cupboard, his own phonograph, his own bedroom speaks to him in a personal way … the more perfectly he is ready to accept wholesale whatever he hears. (p. 70)

Here radio becomes the perfect instrument of bourgeois governance, an ideal socio-affective guidance system (or, in Michel Foucault's phrase, a technology of the self) for a society that requires individuals to recreate themselves in the image of the standardised collective. The voice of Adorno that most of us recognise from *The Dialectic of Enlightenment* (co-written with Max Horkheimer just after the contract with Lazarsfeld ended and Adorno moved to Los Angeles) emerges with great clarity and conviction.

Of course, in the American context the 'public utility' of radio was, at the same time, a private, corporate concern: Adorno's claims about the private reception of public authority should be tempered by the specific institutional contexts of production and the very different presence and absence of the state in the United States. For my purposes what is most interesting is the degree to which Adorno sounds rather more like Benjamin in these writings on radio than not. In his fascinating discussion of 'radio ubiquity' he cites Benjamin and notes an important difference between the idea of the original in music and in the visual arts: 'Every score is, in a way, only a system of prescriptions for possible reproduction, and nothing "in itself"' (p. 89). For Adorno, the live performance of music involves technical reproduction,

that is, reading and playing from a score. The uniqueness that would otherwise be attributed to an original work of visual art (and which grounds the 'aura' that Benjamin famously argues is dispersed or liquidated through photographic and filmic reproduction), in music is attributed to the authenticity of live performance – a performance that is, in itself, a reproduction or reading. Adorno argues that 'the remnants of the pre-technical concept of authenticity' (p. 91) is a cultural ideal that radio opposes and that should be given up, although he acknowledges the difficulty of discarding ideals that are promoted for social and ideological reasons. These ideals, the phantasmagorical aspects of radio that Kane identifies, should be distinguished from the introjective phantasies that are exploited and made to serve them.

Practically and politically, what emerges from Adorno's writings is a powerful analytic attempt to separate radio from its social ideals: 'the ideal of imitating live music and the ideal of maintaining the privacy of public experience … if radio gives up these two "ideals" some of the technical characteristics which we considered most problematic would be dropped' (p. 72). Examples from the 1930s of the two ideals that Adorno would reject are not hard to find. Franklin Roosevelt's 'Fireside Chats' used radio's intimate address to maintain the privacy of public experience as an instrument of governance, while the proliferation of programmes that aimed to educate American listeners about European symphonic music promoted the imitation of live music in the service of so-called social uplift. We could also think of forms of music emerging in the 1930s and 1940s that began to forego the ideal of imitating live music, whether by using electronic sounds or (a little later) magnetic tape, and performance that insisted on the publicity of radio listening. Certainly, some of John Cage's pieces ('Imaginary Landscape No. 1' and his radio play with Kenneth Patchen *The City Wears a Slouch Hat*) fit this description, as would the work of American composers after Cage such as Alvin Lucier and Robert Ashley.

If Adorno presents an analysis of the radio voice as an index to the aesthetic situation of the listener in the subordinated privacy of the home, I argue that the phantasmagorical sense of privacy depends on studio transmission and a phantasised double introjection of the microphone. Phantasy being primary, whatever authority radio has is less a condition of the listener's actual isolation than on how she hears and takes in the cultural ideals and institutional authority of the broadcaster. In the US context, this authority is less that of a public utility than of state-sponsored commercial radio, that is, the authority of allegedly free enterprise. Perhaps this is why Stein's very brief discussion of her radio experience in her autobiographical writing emphasises the following:

> I talked over the radio once, they never seemed to want to pay you for doing that unless it is advertising, that seemed to us a very strange thing, so I talked once naturally nobody wanted to pay me for advertising. (EA, p. 198)

Bennet Cerf reports in his memoir on a brief argument he had after the broadcast when the actress Miriam Hopkins insisted that Stein should have been paid for her appearance: '"Bennett ought to be ashamed of himself," she declared. "Gertrude, don't you *ever* go on radio again unless you get at least five hundred dollars for it"' (1, p. 04). Cerf defends himself by insisting that radio offered Stein free publicity, but Stein sides with Hopkins's Hollywood-based understanding that talent should be paid for their time and is made uncomfortable by a compromised transaction that undermines her authority as producer. In other words, Stein came into conflict with the particular authority of commercial radio which, of course, is not really free: advertisers pay for it, which means that we listeners also pay with our time and attention, a variety of positive and negative affective responses, fantasies, and phantasies that conduce toward our subjectification. Benjamin insists that we can always turn the radio off, but Adorno thinks otherwise.[56]

The longer essay from which these pages are taken move, in a final section, to a reading of two of Stein's works from the 19-teens which the *Radio Free Stein* project has produced as part of a chamber opera that ends with a violent encounter with the Voice of the Radio. There I unfold Stein's phenomenological exploration of plays as acousmatic and return to Adorno's thinking about the ubiquity of sound reproduction. But for now, I simply conclude by stating the conclusion of my argument: that with radio in mind, Stein's theatre makes more sense.

Notes

1. Mark Wollaeger, *Modernism, Media, and Propaganda: British Narrative from 1900 to 1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), p. 3.
2. Ibid., pp. xi–xii.
3. The privileged status once accorded to film as the exemplary technology for modernism has now been extended to typewriter, gramophone, telephone, wireless and radio, newsprint, halftone lithography, and others. See, among many others, David Trotter, *Literature in the First Media Age: Britain Between the Wars* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), Mark Goble, *Broadcasting Circuits: Modernism and the Mediated Life* (New York City: Columbia University Press, 2010), and Julian Murphet, *Multimedia Modernism: Literature and the Anglo-American Avant-garde* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
4. See Ian Whittington, 'Radio Studies and 20th-Century Literature: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Remediation', *Literary Compass*, 11, no. 9 (2014), pp. 634–48. Major publications on the subject of radio and literary modernism include Neil Strauss, ed., *Radiotext(e)* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1993); Douglas Kahn and Gregory Whitehead, eds, *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992); Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty, eds, *Broadcasting Modernism* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009) and the follow-up special issue,

Deborah Rae Cohen and Michael Coyle, eds, *Modernist Cultures*, 10, no. 1 (2015); Julian Murphet et al., eds, *Sounding Modernism: Rhythm and Sonic Mediation in Modern Literature and Film* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017); Martin Harries and Lecia Rosenthal, eds, 'Comparative Radios', special issue of *Cultural Critique*, 91 (Fall 2015); John Mowitt, *Radio: Essays in Bad Reception* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011).

5. Except for an excellent article by Sarah Wilson, 'Gertrude Stein and the Radio', *Modernism/modernity*, 11, no. 2 (2004), scholarship on Stein and modernist media has focused largely on cinema and celebrity.
6. Adam Frank, *Transferential Poetics, from Poe to Warhol* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015). See also 'The Expansion of Setting in Gertrude Stein's Landscape Theater', *Modernism/modernity*, PRINTPLUS, 3, no. 1 (5 March 2018). https://doi.org/10.26597/mod.0042.
7. Joan Richardson, *A Natural History of Pragmatism: The Fact of Feeling from Jonathan Edwards to Gertrude Stein* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
8. John Durham Peters, *Speaking into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 225.
9. Ibid., pp. 21–2.
10. 'Gertrude Stein Interviewed by William Lundell', Recorded 12 October 1934 on NBC. YCAL MSS 77, Series IX Box HSR, CD. no. 36, Gertrude and Alice B. Toklas Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. The recording I was given (which dropped audio at 4′30″ and 9′43″ but seems otherwise complete) is a digitised copy of the CD located at Yale University's collection of Historical Sound Recording at the Irving S. Gilmore Music Library. Thanks to Mark Bailey for locating this recording and to Jonathan Manton for making it available to me. Beinecke's CD was copied from a reel-to-reel recording also located in the collection. The broadcast would have been initially recorded on electrical transcription discs.
11. 'Gertrude Stein Interviewed by William Lundell', YCAL MSS 76, Box 140, folder 3293, Gertrude and Alice B. Toklas Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. The folder describes this item as a transcript but this is unlikely. There are discrepancies between it and the audio recording, and the script's last page includes the typists' initials and date, 'kh/vh/11/10/34', two days before the broadcast. This item is a copy of the prepared script that Lundell and Stein used as a basis for the broadcast. Steven Meyer has published a version of the interview that takes into account aspects of both script and audio recording. 'Gertrude Stein: A Radio Interview', *Paris Review*, 116 (Fall 1990), pp. 85–97. As well, it appears in *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*, Vol. 48 (Gale Research Inc., 1993), pp. 208–11.
12. *Radio Announcers* (1934), p. 10. https://worldradiohistory.com/Archive-Station-Albums/Networks/Radio-Announcers-1934-NBC.pdf.
13. Rudolf Arnheim, *Radio: An Art of Sound*, trans. Margaret Ludwig and Herbert Read (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972), p. 211. Originally published in 1936.
14. Ibid., p. 220, p. 224, p. 218.
15. 'I Came and Here I Am', *Hearst's International-Cosmopolitan* (February 1935), pp. 18–19, *cont'd* pp. 167–8. Reprinted in Robert Bartett Haas, ed., *How Writing Is Written: Volume II of the Previously Uncollected Writings of*

Gertrude Stein (Los Angeles, CA: Black Sparrow Press, 1974). This reprint mistakenly dates the article to February 1936.

16. Ibid., p. 168.
17. Arnheim, *Radio*, p. 218.
18. Meyer, 'Gertrude Stein: A Radio Interview', p. 86. On the importance of intonation in Stein see especially Johanna Frank, 'Resonating Bodies and the Poetics of Aurality; Or; Gertrude Stein's Theatre', *Modern Drama*, 51, no. 4 (2008), Scott Pound, 'The Difference Sound Makes: Gertrude Stein and the Poetics of Intonation', *English Studies in Canada*, 33, no. 4 (2007), and Steven Meyer, *Irresistible Dictation: Gertrude Stein and the Correlations of Writing and Science* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).
19. Milton Kaplan, *Radio and Poetry* (Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 150.
20. For a fuller version of this argument see Adam Frank, 'Exercises in Group Analysis: Sounding Out Stein's Plays', in Logan Esdale and Deborah Mix (eds), *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Gertrude Stein* (New York: MLA, 2019).
21. Stein's remarkable fame following the bestselling success of *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* (1933) and US lecture tour (1934–1935) is the subject of a number of studies. See especially Loren Glass, *Authors Inc.: Literary Celebrity in the United States, 1880–1980* (New York: NYU Press, 2004), Karen Leick, *Gertrude Stein and the Making of an American Celebrity* (New York: Routledge, 2009), Sharon J. Kirsch, 'Gertrude Stein Delivers', *Rhetoric Review*, 31, no. 3 (2012), Lise Jaillant, *'Shucks we've got glamour girls too!* Gertrude Stein, Bennett Cerf and the Culture of Celebrity', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 39, no. 1 (2015), and Robert Volpicelli, *Transatlantic Modernism and the U.S. Lecture Tour* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021).
22. For an invaluable chronology of the events of this tour see William Rice, 'Gertrude Stein's American Lecture Tour', Appendix I of Edward M. Burns and Ulla A. Dydo (eds), *The Letters of Gertrude Stein and Thornton Wilder* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996).
23. Stein, 'I Came and Here I Am', p. 168.
24. Ibid., p. 168.
25. Ibid., p. 167.
26. 'Gertrude Stein Interviewed by William Lundell', 1′13″–1′34″.
27. Stein, 'I Came and Here I Am', p. 167.
28. Ibid., p. 167.
29. Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1981).
30. Stein, 'I Came and Here I Am', p. 168.
31. Gertrude Stein, 'Meditations on Being About to Visit My Native Land', in *Painted Lace and Other Pieces (1914–1937)* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 255.
32. Gertrude Stein, *Lectures in America* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1985), p. 170. On Stein's use of the term *essence* as related to fuel see Dana Cairns Watson, *Gertrude Stein and the Essence of What Happens* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005), p. 66, and Astrid Lorange, *How Reading Is Written: A Brief Index to Gertrude Stein* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2014), pp. 167–8.
33. Stein, 'I Came and Here I Am', p. 168.
34. Ibid., p. 168.

35. Ibid., p. 168.
36. Ibid., p. 168.
37. Ibid., p. 168.
38. Bennet Cerf, *At Random: The Reminiscences of Bennet Cerf*, ed. Phyllis Cerf Wagner and Albert Eskine (New York: Random House, 1977), p. 103.
39. Ibid., p. 103.
40. Ibid., p. 102.
41. Gertrude Stein, *Everybody's Autobiography* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), pp. 283–4.
42. William Rice, 'Gertrude Stein's American Lecture Tour', p. 351. These recordings have been made available at PennSound: http://writing.upenn.edu/pennsound/x/Stein.php.
43. A similar wish can be found in George Orwell's short piece 'Poetry and the Microphone' (1945) where he contrasts the potentially hostile audience at 'That grisly thing, a "poetry reading"' with radio broadcasting in which 'The poet *feels* that he is addressing people to whom poetry means something'. In Neil Strauss, ed., *Radiotext(e)* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1993), p. 167.
44. 'Gertrude Stein Interviewed by William Lundell', 3′06″–3′48″.
45. Ibid., 5′18″–5′33″.
46. Martin Harries and Lecia Rosenthal, 'Introduction to "Comparative Radios"', *Cultural Critique*, 91 (2015), pp. 1–13.
47. Ibid., p. 6.
48. Theodor Adorno, *Current of Music*, ed. and with an introduction by Robert Hullot-Kentor (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009), p. 44.
49. Ibid., p. 49.
50. Susan Douglas, *Listening In: Radio and the American Imagination* (New York: Random House, 1999), p. 125.
51. Brian Kane, 'Phenomenology, Physiognomy, and the "Radio Voice"', *New German Critique*, 129 (2016), 43:3, pp. 91–112.
52. Adorno cites Bernfield's 1937 essay whose title in English would be 'The Revision of Bioanalysis'. For more information on Bernfeld see Rudolf Ekstein, 'Siegfried Bernfeld: Sisyphus or the Boundaries of Education', in Franz Alexander, Samuel Eisenstein, and Martin Grotjahn (eds), *Psychoanalytic Pioneers* (New York: Basic Books, 1966).
53. Elizabeth A. Wilson, *Gut Feminism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).
54. R.D. Hinshelwood, *A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought* (London: Free Association Books, 1989), p. 32.
55. John Mowitt, 'Facing the Radio', in *Radio: Essays in Bad Reception* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011), p. 37.
56. On switching off the radio see Walter Benjamin, 'Reflections on Radio', ed. Lecia Rosenthal, trans. Jonathan Lutes in *Radio Benjamin* (New York: Verso Books, 2014), pp. 363–4, and Adorno, *Current of Music*, p. 112.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).