



HER

STORIES

DAYTIME SOAP OPERA

& US TELEVISION HISTORY

ELANA LEVINE

HER STORIES

CONSOLE-ING PASSIONS: Television and Cultural Power *Edited by Lynn Spiegel*

HER STORIES

DAYTIME SOAP OPERA & US TELEVISION HISTORY

Elana Levine

Duke University Press *Durham and London* 2020

© 2020 DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Designed by Courtney Leigh Baker

Typeset in Minion Pro and Trade Gothic by

Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Levine, Elana, [date] author.

Title: Her stories : daytime soap opera and US television history /
Elana Levine.

Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2020. |

Series: Console-ing passions | Includes bibliographical
references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019023970 (print)

LCCN 2019023971 (ebook)

ISBN 9781478007661 (hardcover)

ISBN 9781478008019 (paperback)

ISBN 9781478009061 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Television soap operas—United States—History
and criticism.

Classification: LCC PN1992.8.S4 L47 2020 (print) | LCC PN1992.8.S4
(ebook) | DDC 791.45/69287—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019023970>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019023971>

Cover art: TV playwright Agnes E. Nixon. © Charles Bonnay/

The LIFE Images Collection. Courtesy Getty Images.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments · vii

Introduction · 1

PART I THE NEW TV SOAP Late 1940s to Early 1960s

1 Serials in Transition: From Radio to Television · 19

2 Daytime Therapy: Help and Healing in the Postwar Soap · 44

PART II THE CLASSIC NETWORK ERA Mid-1960s to Late 1980s

3 Building Network Power: The Broadcasting Business
and the Craft of Soap Opera · 73

4 Turning to Relevance: Social Issue Storytelling · 106

5 Love in the Afternoon: The Fracturing Fantasies
of the Soap Boom · 153

PART III A POST-NETWORK AGE Late 1980s to 2010s

6 Struggles for Survival: Stagnation and Innovation · 199

7 Reckoning with the Past: Reimagining Characters
and Stories · 236

8 Can Her Stories Go On? Soap Opera in a Digital Age · 280

Notes · 299

Bibliography · 357

Index · 369

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My experience of researching and writing this book has had surprising parallels to the world of daytime TV soap opera it examines. While I have neither faced shocking returns from the dead nor been bestowed a fairy-tale wedding, most moments of soap opera, and most of research and writing, are far more mundane, more about daily choices around small matters that together build to a compelling story. Crucially, both on-screen and behind the scenes, soap operas depend on communities, whether of characters or workers. So, too, has my research and writing been embedded within a number of communities that have supported and sustained it.

The University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee has afforded me essential support over the twelve years I have worked on this project. I received vital research, thinking, and writing time through two fellowships from the Center for 21st Century Studies and two semester-long sabbaticals. I am gratified to have received UWM's Arts and Humanities Faculty Travel grants, a Graduate School Research Award, and a Research and Creative Activities Support Award, which together helped to fund my domestic archival research and supported some of my writing time. The university's undergraduate research programs also provided me some research assistance early on through the work of students Sally McCarty and Desiree Smith and later that of Audrey Waln. I have also benefited from the research support of students and staff in my department, in particular from Ashley Kappers, Anna Kupiecki, Michelle Fetherston, Ana Teske, and Emily Talapa.

My research was supported financially by two entities external to my university, as well. The Walter Jay and Clara Charlotte Damm Fund of the Journal Communications Foundation provided me with a grant that subsidized my initial archival research travel. So too did the American Heritage Center at the University of Wyoming offer support for my travel to its impressive collection.

I have noted the many institutional archives that were crucial to my work through citation and a list of archival resources in the bibliography. All the

libraries and archives I have used have provided essential services, but some were especially instrumental. Kevin B. Leonard at Northwestern University provided me with crucial materials and connected me with Agnes Nixon. Sharon Black at the Annenberg School library of the University of Pennsylvania helped me to access the uncataloged archive of Nixon's scripts. Special thanks are due to Mark Quigley and the staff at the UCLA Film and Television Archive for converting many episodes into formats that made them accessible for my viewing. Greater funding could help archives like this to convert more rare television recordings into forms watchable in the present, a crucial investment for television history. Closer to home, I am especially grateful to the Area Research Network and the staffs at the Wisconsin Historical Society and the UWM Archives for coordinating the transportation of many materials for me from Madison to Milwaukee. I am also grateful to have connected with three graduate students who followed up on lingering questions from archives to which I could not travel: Lindsey Giggey, Bailey Kelley, and Patricia Kessler.

My research benefited greatly from conversations with key figures in the daytime soap opera industry. Holly Cato discovered my work and connected me with the longtime executive producer Paul Rauch, who graciously spoke with me by phone in the very early days of my research. I am so thankful to have learned about his experiences firsthand before his passing. So, too, do I remain amazed that I had the honor of speaking to—and sharing tea with!—the remarkable Agnes Nixon in her home not long before her passing. Her legendary graciousness and wit were very much in evidence from the moment she greeted me with “Welcome to Pine Valley!” I thank Kevin Leonard and Ms. Nixon's daughter, Cathy, for facilitating this conversation. R. Colin Tait introduced me to former soap writer Richard Allen, whose insights were very helpful. My fellow soap researcher Mary Jeanne Wilson kindly connected me to Frank Valentini and Nathan Varni at ABC. They both shared their time and insights about the soap business, which were crucial to shaping the last chapters. Donny Sheldon at *General Hospital* helped to make these meetings happen. I was delighted to learn more about contemporary soap production from actor Max Gail, thanks to Eleanor Patterson. Thanks as well to Stanley Moger for sharing select episodes of *The Doctors* with me.

Yet another group of individuals essential to my book were the journalists, lay archivists, and fans of daytime soap opera who were rich sources of information. Especially helpful were Lynn Liccardo, Patrick Erwin, Roger Newcomb, Sarah Adams, Jane Marsh, Salimah Perkins, Brian Puckett, Eddie

Drueding, and Stacey Lopez. Sam Ford has long been a key bridge for me between the academic and professional worlds of taking soaps seriously. I have been fortunate enough to be able to draw on these people's deep knowledge of soap history through personal communication. These colleagues are joined by the many named, anonymous, and pseudonymous folks who have chronicled and archived soap history in magazines, blogs, social media feeds, and user-generated video channels, doing as much as any official institution to make this book possible. I literally could not have done it without them.

I also owe great thanks to my many academic peers who have supported this endeavor in so many ways, from pointing me to key sources to offering thoughtful feedback on my ideas. Those who have shared specific primary sources are models of scholarly generosity: Leigh Goldstein, Marsha Cassidy, Deborah Jaramillo, Cynthia Meyers, Andrew Owens, Jonah Horwitz, Caryn Murphy, Denise Bielby, C. Lee Harrington, and my former student Shawn Glinis. These colleagues and others, including Philip Sewell, Jason Mittell, Chris Becker, Zachary Campbell, Faye Woods, and Kim Bjarkman, have helped me figure out where to look when I puzzled over particular questions. Everyone should benefit from enthusiastic and friendly sounding boards such as Carol Stabile, Michele Hilmes, Jennifer Wang, Allison McCracken, Caryn Murphy, Rick Popp, Amanda Keeler, Leigh Goldstein, Jonah Horwitz, Ron Becker, and Lynn Spigel. Richard Grusin and Maureen Ryan helped me refine a key point at the very end. Christine Evans was a great café-writing companion.

When you work on a project over such a long time, a lot of life happens along the way. During this period, Noah Newman was born and grew into the sunny kid who keeps me laughing, while his brother, Leo Newman, became a talented young man who will even watch *General Hospital* with me from time to time. Michael Newman has been beside me before, during, and after this book's emergence, taking care of our children when my research took me away, offering keen writing guidance, and listening to my excited descriptions of research finds. I could not wish for a better partner in all things.

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1973, fourteen-year-old Jane Marsh recorded her thoughts and feelings in a daily journal, including her reactions to her favorite daytime TV soap operas. She looked forward to seeing the “gorgeous” actor Joseph Gallison on *Return to Peyton Place* (NBC, 1972–74), but she worried that the program would be preempted by a different continuing saga, “Watergate,” labeled in her journal with the same quotation marks she used for the other stories she followed, like “As the World Turns.” “Watergate” often aired in place of the soaps the week of June 25, as former White House counsel John Dean testified before the US Senate’s investigative committee. Jane was resentful—and intrigued: “‘Watergate’ has been on all week. John Dean is testifying. I think he’s cute. So are Senators Howard Baker and Edward Gurney. . . . It was getting kind of interesting lately. It was boring before. Dean says Nixon knew about the cover-up. Dean’s wife is very pretty.”¹ Alternating moments of tedium and excitement, featuring attractive leading men and their love interests, plus the revelation of closely held secrets, “Watergate” was familiar terrain for the young soap opera fan. As part of the growing youth audience for daytime drama, Jane was invested in the soaps’ characters and their portrayers, learning about both through the burgeoning fan press, even as she had been watching with her mother and sister since the mid-1960s. She grasped the political significance of Watergate, but her soap viewing had also encouraged her to practice feminized skills such as assessing character, evaluating personal relationships, and identifying (hetero) sexual desire. In applying these insights at the safe remove of the TV screen, Jane made “Watergate” one of her stories.

In the summer of 2018, fifty-eight-year-old Jane Marsh was still watching soaps. Instead of writing about them in her journal, she tweeted about them; this is how I first encountered Jane. She wrote about NBC’s *Days of our Lives* (1965–), and sometimes ABC’s *General Hospital* (1963–), but mostly about the early 1970s episodes of *The Doctors* (1963–82), originally aired on NBC

but now rerunning on the twenty-first-century broadcast network Retro TV, its programming carried nationwide on digital subchannels and low-power stations. Much as in her 1973 journal, Jane's tweets combined observations about the soaps with political commentary; like many Americans, she noted the similarities between Watergate and the scandals of Donald Trump's presidency.² With maturity and the passage of time, her insights had changed, now more critical than adoring, particularly when *The Doctors* represented a character such as the surly Nick Bellini as heroic, when he had actually raped his wife, or when *DOOL*'s Steve told off his wife Kayla's boss, to which Jane tweeted, "She's capable of speaking for herself. :/"³ She shared letters from early 1970s soap viewers published in the fan press, magazines she had saved from her childhood, noting with irony, "Many of the complaints are the same as from current soap fans."⁴ She still expressed her fondness for particular characters, stories, and performers, now with more cynicism about the motivations of the TV business, as well as more wisdom about personal relationships. She knew where the plot of *The Doctors* was going, having watched it more than forty years earlier, offering "spoiler alerts" about events that would unfold later in the 1970s.⁵ She also knew that some of the more problematic gender politics on display would not change as much as one might have expected between the 1970s and the present, that certain aspects of the retro-soap were not so out of place in the 2010s. In Jane's feed, continuities and disruptions across time, in controversies real and fictional, from the drama of the political sphere to that of scripted fiction, converged. Jane's experience of daytime soap opera mirrors the experiences of many watching soaps across their lives.

These layers of time are especially familiar to me, someone who has been thinking about soaps for more than thirty-five years. I was aware of them across my childhood because my Aunt Bonne, who lived across the street, had been watching *DOOL* since before I was born. But in the fall of 1981 things changed. My fellow sixth graders at Adlai E. Stevenson Elementary were talking a lot about Luke and Laura, whose *General Hospital* wedding was imminent. My mom had heard about it, too—the show was everywhere. The day of the wedding, November 16, one of my friends brought to school a radio that received TV channels. During our afternoon recess we gathered together to listen. Around the same time, my father brought home a device that allowed us to record a TV show and view it later; recording *GH*'s daily episodes became the perfect way to use our new VCR. Like Jane in her youth, I became a serious soap watcher. *General Hospital* was my show, but I knew about all of them through my voracious consumption of fan magazines. In

the decades to follow, I kept watching, time-shifting every episode through-out high school, college, working years, graduate school, my job as a professor. I moved, attained degrees, dated, broke up, lost my dad to cancer, got married, had two kids, lived a life, watched *GH*.

I wrote my first paper about soaps in high school, after reading Ruth Rosen's essay "Search for Yesterday."⁶ My pen pal from the fan club of *GH* actor Jack Wagner gave me *The Soap Opera Encyclopedia* for my sixteenth birthday.⁷ I picked up Robert C. Allen's *Speaking of Soap Operas* from Chicago's Museum of Broadcast Communications gift shop soon after it opened in 1987; I also watched soap episodes in the museum's collection—my first archival research visit.⁸ In college I learned that academics were now studying TV as they did movies; it didn't take me long to want in. Graduate school helped me understand the academic research on soap opera; my first graduate seminar paper was about soaps. My first academic publication was about the production of *GH*—the program's producers invited me to visit after I sent them a letter asking to research their work.⁹ Not yet sure what broader questions I had about soap opera, I decided against making it the focus of my dissertation, though I did explore the daytime dramas of the 1970s in one chapter. Years later, eventually, inevitably, it was time to write *Her Stories*. I would spend another twelve years researching and writing, on top of the quarter century I'd already spent with soaps. As I worked, I have found myself dwelling, seemingly simultaneously, in periods of the soap past I have lived before, such as 1981, or 1995. I have also become familiar with moments located in a past before my time, as in 1952, or 1963, or 1969. For soap opera, the past always matters, bearing upon the present and shaping the future.

Soap Opera's Intellectual History

In *Speaking of Soap Operas*, the book I was so excited to discover as a teenager, Allen wrote of the impossibility of a full textual history of a soap. He enumerated the thousands of hours passed of *Guiding Light* (CBS, 1952–2009), his soap, many of them evaporated into air thanks to live broadcasts, never preserved.¹⁰ His point was that a traditionally defined aesthetic object was not essential for the study of culture; that cultural forms, soaps included, had multifaceted existences; that they were more than text, they were forces of production and practices of viewing and discussions of their impact.¹¹ Soap opera was his case for a broader and crucial point, an intervention in fact, one refuting the formalism of traditional aesthetic criticism and

the empiricism of American mass communication research. Allen argued for an analysis of culture that drew upon theories of meaning making, a “reader-oriented poetics.”¹² He demonstrated this approach through a history of soap opera focused mainly on its origins in US broadcast network radio, when it was constructed industrially and socially as programming for housewives. His way of grappling with soap opera was a crucial shift for the fields of media and cultural studies but was only a start at what might be said of the history of the US daytime soap, a point with which Allen would surely agree, given his desire not to “close off the soap opera from further analysis . . . but rather to open it up . . . to reveal the full extent of its multiple determinations.”¹³ Carrying on this endeavor, I have sought to apply Allen’s lessons, and his start at a history, to put into historical perspective the ways soap opera has changed, or not, over time, focusing in particular on the (many more) years of its tenure on television rather than Allen’s emphasis on the radio age. *Her Stories* is a history of the US daytime television soap opera as a gendered cultural form and a central force in the economic and social power of American broadcast network television from the late 1940s through the 2010s.

Allen’s pioneering work emerged in the 1980s alongside other strands of scholarship that considered soap opera, scholarship that initiated the cultural analysis of television as an academic field. In some of the earliest humanistic readings of television as a cultural form, as in Horace Newcomb’s *TV: The Most Popular Art* (1974), soap opera is figured as the quintessence of television’s potential as storyteller.¹⁴ Soap opera was also a central case in the emerging field of British cultural studies, a frequent example of popular television culture among scholars in the United Kingdom, studying British soaps, and those in the United States, translating these ideas to American culture and its serial dramas.¹⁵ The British cultural studies work on soap opera intersected with efforts of feminist film scholars to examine television, to consider how the domestic medium might speak about gender in ways different from the dominant “male gaze” of Hollywood film and in ways like or unlike other forms associated with women, such as melodrama and the women’s film.¹⁶ As Charlotte Brunsdon has explained, all of this work on soap opera was crucial to the positioning of feminism within the academy, and also central to the establishment of popular culture as a valid field of intellectual inquiry.¹⁷ These efforts not only paved my own path but also established new perspectives on the study of television, of popular culture, and of women’s culture—soap opera was embedded in the intellectual foundation of these burgeoning fields.

Her Stories is multiply influenced by these scholarly traditions, but it also differs from them, continuing the study of soap opera beyond these earlier inquiries and departing from them by examining soap opera as a historically specific and variable form rather than as static and fixed. As such, I draw on and expand upon developments in both film and television scholarship focused on the concept of genre as an operative system of media classification. My approach shares with scholars such as Rick Altman and Jason Mittell a commitment to a contextual, rather than transhistorical, view. Their work invites a consideration of differences and disruptions in media genres over time rather than insisting upon the coherence of continuities across instances.¹⁸ I approach soap opera akin to the way these scholars approach genre, exploring changes in relation to media industry structures, production processes, critical discourses, and reception practices, varying by place and time.

While I attend to the ways that daytime soap opera has operated as a category of TV programming within industrial and popular discourse, *Her Stories* reveals that soap opera has been much more foundational to the history of American television than is typical of a single genre. Unlike the game show or the cop show, “genre” may not be the best descriptor for soap opera. A comparison with the place of melodrama within the world of feature film is instructive. In film culture and scholarship, melodrama is a category that at times has shared with soap opera an association with the feminine and the histrionic, particularly when used as a synonym for the classical Hollywood “woman’s film.”¹⁹ Scholars such as Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams have argued that melodrama is best understood not as a *genre* but rather as a widespread narrative *mode* informing much of American cultural history.²⁰ While the continuing, serialized structure of the daytime TV soap opera makes such a vast cultural reach less feasible, I argue that the economic and cultural form of soap opera plays a similarly constitutive role for television itself, undergirding the medium in ways that make it far more foundational than would be the case were soap opera simply another broadcast genre.

To trace the influence of the daytime TV soap opera, *Her Stories* focuses on two primary axes of change over time. One is change in US broadcast network television as an economic and social institution, wherein soap opera can be seen as tracking the practices and fortunes of the system as a whole. The other is change in cultural constructions of gender and intersecting aspects of social identity, including race, class, and sexuality. Given the status of soap opera as a form associated with women, my focus is especially on femininity (albeit in juxtaposition to masculinity), a femininity that has

often been imagined by TV creators as white, middle-class, and heteronormative, but which gets regularly complicated and even fractured in the convolutions of soap storytelling and the investments of soap viewers. Both of these axes of change have received their own historical and theoretical treatment, independently and intertwined, as in certain works of broadcast history and television theory that have pointed to the feminized positioning of television in relation to the domestic sphere and within the culture at large.²¹ *Her Stories* furthers such work and speaks to our television heritage more broadly, combining analyses of the social construction of femininity and of American network television in and through the daytime TV soap opera, a form imagined as speaking to and about women, and persisting across US television history.

Instead of taking soap opera's feminized status at face value, my approach seeks to use soap opera to "examine gender concretely and in context, and to consider it a historical phenomenon, produced, reproduced, and transformed in different situations and over time."²² As Joan Scott writes of feminist history more generally, I am approaching soap opera as "a site of the production of gender knowledge," of how our culture has come to know and understand meanings and experiences of gender.²³ As such, I am following a tradition in feminist media and cultural studies of understanding media forms as participants in broader social constructions of identity categories, not to assert a direct or exclusive causal chain between popular culture and society, or to document the lived histories of women as universal or even knowable, but to offer insights into a question posed by Lynn Spigel of "how mass culture reacts to (as well as contributes to) the social and historical construction of femininity."²⁴

Yet the history of soap opera cannot be restricted to the sphere of "women's history" or even a history of gender or gendered cultural forms. For the history of soap opera does not occur in a gendered ghetto. Rather, it is central to the history of American television in its workings as a commercial, cultural, and aesthetic force. Rethinking American television history through the history of soap opera shifts our perspective so that this gendered form is not an afterthought but rather a central player in a history we thought we knew. *Her Stories* is not an appended "her-story" running behind the main "his-story" of American television; it *is* American television history, a lens through which to see the economic, creative, technological, social, and experiential path of television across seventy years that exposes its gendered structure.²⁵ The history of the US daytime TV soap opera is a history of a media form, but it is also a history of a prominent cultural construction of

femininity and its imbrication within the institutional and artistic evolution of the primary mass medium in American society for nearly three-quarters of a century.

The Prehistory of the US TV Soap

Her Stories explores the many ways in which the daytime TV soap opera has been a crucial participant in the social construction of gendered identity as imagined by the American TV industry and its personnel, as well as in the development and evolution of television as both a business and a means of audiovisual storytelling. But soap opera is not native to television, nor are the serialized stories of the soaps their sole invention. Narratives that continue from installment to installment have been part of Western culture since at least the nineteenth century. As Jennifer Hayward notes, since that time, “Producers have relied on the serial form to consolidate and hold a mass audience,” whether in mass-produced fiction, newspaper comic strips, early filmed adventure tales, or scripted narratives of radio and TV.²⁶

The soap opera as we know it was a product of the system of network radio broadcasting launched in the 1920s, its name derisively intended to juxtapose the banal goods sold by its sponsor-owners with the melodramatic intensity associated with an elite performing art. As the number of these fifteen-minute daily dramas grew, by the early 1940s, “The soap opera form constituted 90 percent of all sponsored network radio programming broadcast during the daylight hours.”²⁷ Daytime serials were substantial money-makers for the networks and for the ad agencies that produced them, and they proved valuable sales tools for their sponsors. In 1945, the daytime serials brought in to NBC and CBS \$30 million in time charges, about 22 percent of these networks’ total revenue and, due to their low production costs, about 15 percent of the gross of all network broadcasting.²⁸ Ad agencies like Blackett-Sample-Hummert, home base of the Frank and Anne Hummert radio serial empire, established themselves as major industry players with their serials’ “hard-sell” approach.²⁹ Manufacturers of household goods—laundry and dish soaps, breakfast foods—found the serials an ideal advertising vehicle that helped them to achieve an oligopoly in their markets.³⁰

In tandem with their commercial utility, the serials were also a significant cultural space for their women audiences, as radio historians have shown. More than a realm for considering the travails of domestic life, the serials connected the private sphere with the public, helping their audiences

to grapple with the world around them and their places as women within it, what Jason Loviglio calls “the public/private dichotomy in American social life.”³¹ As Michele Hilmes explains, “Daytime serials both addressed and helped to create an explicitly feminine subaltern counterpublic, reinforcing and acknowledging the differences between men’s and women’s lives within the hierarchy of American culture, and providing ways to envision changes, negotiations, and oppositions.”³² Radio serials were not raising radical challenges to the mainstream; rather, they were offering opportunities for listeners to imagine their lives, and the world around them, in ways that sometimes supported and sometimes opposed dominant expectations of thinking and living.

During World War II, the serials’ attention to connections between public and private matters became all the more acute, as the US government asked serial creators to assist the war effort. As radio historians such as Gerd Horten, Kathy M. Newman, and Marilyn Lavin have detailed, daytime serials often took as their central subject matter women’s duties in the working world and in the home, from exploring women’s paid, wartime labor to valorizing domestic tasks such as cooking.³³ The serials’ stance on such matters was the product of complex negotiation among the US government, serial sponsors, networks, agency-producers, writer-creators, and audiences, a mix of stakeholders that would grapple with one another across soap opera history.

Understanding just what audiences got from their serial listening was a preoccupation of the broadcasting industry and of commentators in the press, one bound up with anxieties about gendered hierarchies and social identities. As Allen’s work documents, from the outset the daytime audience was constructed as “that which must be explained,” as if the (male) executives of the broadcasting industry, the trade press that covered it, and the researchers studying radio could not fathom why someone would listen to serials.³⁴ In a host of studies initiated by the radio networks, by sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld and the Bureau of Applied Social Research he directed, and by many other researchers, from psychiatrists to anthropologists, the soap opera audience was singled out as distinct from the radio audience more generally, distinguished largely on the basis of gender and marked as aberrant. In the assumptions of many of the studies of soap listeners, and in the popular commentary that was built around them, the soap listener was viewed as “isolated from meaningful social intercourse, unequipped to deal with the ‘real world,’ and forever vulnerable to psychic manipulation.”³⁵ Some cultural commentators and researchers tried to justify and explain the

appeal of serials from a more empathetic perspective, defending women's interest in them.³⁶ During the radio age and since, researchers and commentators have struggled to explain and understand the appeal of these daily dramas, in the process shaping ideas about femininity and domestic life.

The radio soap opera is a well-researched phenomenon, an object that media historians have examined in historically specific detail. But soap opera historiography dissipates with the transition to television, as if the radio age explains all we might want to know about soap opera by exploring its origins. There is a plethora of scholarship on the TV soap, but little of it conceives of it, or the social forces it engages, as contextually specific and variable, as having a history, as changing over time.³⁷ *Her Stories* begins with the radio-to-TV transition of the late 1940s and early 1950s. Integrating daytime soap opera into this history shifts our understanding of this early period of electronic media convergence. In the transition of soap opera can be found some of the earliest negotiations over the shape the new medium would take, the ways it would both continue and vary from the precedents set by radio. From there, the US daytime TV soap opera would embark upon its own history, one influenced by the radio serial but soon speaking more specifically to the economic and creative contexts of television, as well as to the continuing shifts in the construction of identities such as that of the housewife-viewer, a role that would change significantly over the second half of the twentieth century and the early decades of the twenty-first.

From the early 1960s through the middle 1980s, the daytime TV soap was a powerful force in the TV industry and in American culture. The number of soaps on air mushroomed to an all-time high of nineteen in the early 1970s, just as the broadcast networks were growing their profit margins at a rapid rate; by the early 1980s, daytime soaps were a popular sensation. A gradual drop-off in the ratings, profitability, and popularity of soap opera from the mid-1980s on matches the shrinking profile of broadcast network television more generally. In the twenty-first century, the cancellation of a number of soaps, including *Guiding Light*, which had originated in radio, left soap opera proper in a diminished state, even as the form had shaped much of television culture. *Her Stories* traces this “rise and fall” arc, but I seek to complicate that stock narrative by examining points of struggle or regression, as well as innovation and progress, in any given period. As befits its form, the story of the daytime TV soap opera does not have a definitive ending, even as the number of daytime TV soaps on the broadcast networks has shrunk to four as *Her Stories* necessarily concludes. *Her Stories* rethinks soap opera as a historically mutable phenomenon with determinative factors that

vary across time, from the strengths or weaknesses of broadcast network economics to the forces of change that have encouraged tentative efforts to represent subordinated social groups in new ways.

What Stories Does *Her Stories* Tell?

Much like the programs it examines, which span decades, *Her Stories* follows the TV soap across one half century and into the early decades of the next. This time span is unusually broad for the cultural histories of American television upon which my work is modeled. Such work, including my own previous research in US TV history, is often decade-bound, understanding the interplay of the economic forces, reception practices, and representational dynamics of television in historically specific detail, albeit focused on a particular trend or aspect of television rather than accounting for all of its multitudinous programs and production forces.³⁸ Some histories cross decades but select representative case studies of a given phenomenon to trace temporally.³⁹

Her Stories strives to respect the same attention to contextual specificity that is practiced elsewhere in this scholarship, but to do so over a longer swath of time. By zeroing in on soap opera, and by focusing on its storytelling capacity especially around matters of social identity, I streamline my approach. But the long period of time I examine necessitates that I omit aspects of soap opera history, television history, and American cultural history, omissions that I hope will open up future inquiry rather than mark my analysis as incomplete. That said, my story traces three general periods of television history, each of which contains negotiations over soap opera's contribution to constructions of social identity and to changes in television itself.

The first period is that of the immediate post–World War II era, which for soap opera and its constructions of femininity and other aspects of identity begins in the late 1940s and carries through to the early 1960s. Chapters 1 and 2 explore this terrain by detailing the transition from radio to television in the business and production practices of soap creators, and in the convolutions of soap narratives. I include sponsors, networks, writers, production personnel, and on-screen talent within the broad category of soap creators, and I explore their institutional and individual practices, as well as the images, sounds, and stories they generated. Chapter 1 asserts that the efforts of these institutions and individuals were central to shaping the business,

production, and aesthetic practices of television itself. In establishing the economic and creative structures that would make the TV soap possible, these creators molded the contours of the new medium. Their work borrowed heavily from radio but also offered substantial new opportunities. Indeed, this is a period of medium differentiation, of distinguishing television from radio (and, at times, from the stage and feature film) in ways both practical and ideological. The gradual arrival of the daily daytime soap in TV exemplified these processes. Chapter 2 examines the constructions of gender embedded in the era of the new TV soap, in particular the ways soap opera offered a therapeutic salve to the gendered stresses of postwar American life. Soap opera was at the center of a subtle shift across this period in the vision of the woman viewer-consumer held by the broadcasting and consumer goods industries, one that gradually came to see daytime television as a vehicle of psychological help rather than a distraction from the necessary business of homemaking. So too were the soaps' on-screen characters struggling to achieve happiness and well-being within the "containment culture" of the postwar United States.⁴⁰ In keeping with the broader preoccupation with family melodrama across film and television of this era, the daytime soaps upheld ideals of white patriarchal heteronormativity.⁴¹ But the soaps' narrative necessity for ongoing conflict exposed the dissatisfactions of these ideals for their characters, representing mental and emotional stability as elusive goals and thereby challenging the soaps' ability to uphold a consistent ideological stance.

Chapters 3 through 5 traverse the second period of soap opera history, corresponding to the classic network era of American television from the middle 1960s through the late 1980s. This period was the height of the soaps' economic and cultural power. Indeed, in chapter 3 I argue that soap opera was the foundation of the network era business model, that it epitomized and literally upheld the structures of production, distribution, and advertiser funding that earned the networks immense profits and power. At the same time, over this period the soaps led television in grappling with social issues, including race relations and reproductive politics. Daytime drama "turned to relevance" before most of TV, and sometimes did so in subtly progressive ways, advocating for the intersectionality of black women's identity or for women's autonomy over their own bodies. Chapter 4 examines the form's stories of social change, analyzing its strategic balancing of the evolving culture and daytime TV's historic adherence to a narrow vision of its audience as confined to a white, middle-class, reproductive femininity. I argue that a new generation of creators shaped soap opera into

a liberal-leaning cultural forum on the issues of the day, especially those related to changing expectations of gender and (hetero)sexuality. In chapter 5, I detail the peak of soap opera's economic and cultural power, within which were contained seeds of its decline. In the tales of supercouple romance perfected by the early 1980s were the soaps' most resonant pleasures and long-standing limitations. The mass popularity of the form took great advantage of the structures of the network system and luxuriated in the appeals of story worlds that admitted just enough cultural change to feel "of the moment," but both network structure and supercouple fairy tale would prove to be fleeting fantasies.

The third period in the history of American TV soap opera is the focus of chapters 6 through 8. Often labeled the postnetwork or convergence era, the span from the late 1980s through the 2010s is one of declining fortunes for the broadcast networks and also for the daytime dramas that had been so central to network profitability. Chapter 6 analyzes these struggles, pointing to failures of the network system that threatened the status of soaps, and to the ways that the network soap business responded, from aesthetic experimentation to an embrace of the internet as a site of promotion and distribution. At the center of the soaps' slow decline was a changing construction of their audience, wherein the feminized viewership that had once made soaps a valuable property now made them economically and culturally suspect. Chapter 7 examines the same period but instead focuses on the stories and characters of the soaps across these decades. I understand this era as one of engagement with the soaps' own past, wherein the programs sought to reclaim their popular status by reimagining narrative fixtures such as the supercouple and the family. Some of this reimagining progressively confronted constructions of race and sexuality as well as gender, admitting to a new degree nonwhite and nonstraight characters. Other of these narrative paths rejected rather than reimagined the soap past, at times pushing daytime drama in directions that disengaged the very audiences the industry was desperate to retain and attract, doing their own kind of harm to the soaps' future.

Chapter 8 brings this period of decline up to the present of this writing. By the late 2000s the soap business was faced with widespread cancellations of long-running programs and severe austerity measures for those that remained. This chapter charts this reimagined industry but also tracks the emergent sphere of "web soaps" as a return of sorts to soap opera's modest beginnings, albeit now directed at a diverse, fragmented set of audiences rather than an assumed-universal mass. The reimagined soap opera, whether a

product of the independent web or of the shrunken broadcast sphere, necessarily grapples with its own past as its story continues. In the end, the long view *Her Stories* offers makes clear the fluidity of soap opera, whose borders have become less and less fixed over time and whose appeal was never as limited to the feminized, white, middle-class homemaker as both the TV industry and American culture had assumed.

These chapters alternate between an orientation around developments in soap opera production, both economic and creative, and more elaborated attention to the stories the soaps told. These two dimensions of the TV soap—the forces shaping the texts and the meanings of what appears on-screen—are intimately intertwined, but I emphasize particular developments in different chapters to explore each in depth. As a result, I dwell in and retread various periods for more than one chapter in order to cover the mutually determining elements of industry, text, audience, and social context within as well as across periods. In each of the three eras I explore, I examine the differing power of these determining forces, helping us to see the ways that such influences as network hegemony or movements for social change have shaped not only soap opera but also American television more broadly, and the varying ways that television may tell us who we are, and what we want.

While *Her Stories* tracks the daytime soap opera and uses it to think through both American TV history and the mutability of categories (of media and of social identities), the richness of my narrative may best be found in the details, in the ways that creators experimented with particular production techniques, or built audience sympathy over months of scenes, as well as in the means that network executives used to exercise new degrees of control over budget and story, or that fans employed to follow their shows amid days of work or school. Much as in soap narratives themselves, what happens *to* the daytime TV soap, its slow-moving plot, is not nearly as surprising or enlightening as *how* it happens. Ratings rise and fall, budgets expand and contract, stories push open boundaries of social change only to reproduce problematic assumptions. Yet the details of how such forces come and go, of how they interact to shape the resulting programs or develop in dialogue with an audience in search of particular pleasures, can be revelatory. They help us to understand the interactions of social and political forces with the cultural sphere of TV storytelling, to see with fresh eyes the ways that the daytime drama industry has led or sustained the network TV business, to grapple anew with how the entertainment we consume works to affirm or deny our identities and values.

How Have I Researched *Her Stories*?

Despite its culturally denigrated status, the US daytime TV soap opera has a remarkably robust archive. Manuscript collections of the correspondences and memoranda of soap creators, sponsors, and networks, as well as scripts and story projections, fan-targeted books and memoirs, episodes and promotions preserved in official and user-generated collections, the soap press and blogs, fan-built websites—there is a rich array of resources for understanding the history of the daytime TV soap. Yet even this volume of material cannot begin to match the mountains of story, production practice, economic exchange, and everyday experience that have accrued around so many daily-produced serials across seventy years of TV history. Thus, the resources I draw upon have shaped my claims in multiple ways. For example, some of my analyses of narratives and representations rely on story summaries or scripts because there are no extant episodes I can examine. All daytime dramas were broadcast live until the early 1960s, some continuing their live feeds into the early 1970s. There are select kinescoped episodes from the era of live broadcasting available in conventional archives and in user-generated websites, and I have seen all that I know of, but these represent a mere fraction of the episodes aired in the live era.

My archive is much broader than soap episodes alone, but the particularities of the video preservation of soap opera, or lack thereof, are instructive for television historiography writ large. Even once soap episodes were recorded to videotape, they were not always preserved by their producer-owners or their networks; indeed, tape erasure schedules were typical of soap production across the 1960s and 1970s. Although conventional archives preserved select episodes from this period, the outdated formats on which they were recorded make them unwatchable in the present. Unlike other kinds of TV content, commercially available episode runs of soaps are very limited; I have viewed all that do exist.⁴² The era of home videotaping marks an important shift, as fan-collectors have preserved much of soap history from the 1980s on. Indeed, my analysis is rooted in part in my own personal archive, episodes I have saved to videotape, DVD, or digital format over decades. While some fan collections have been shared online, fan-archivists have seen too many episodes removed for copyright violations to rely on such methods alone, instead exchanging private holdings of full episodes and/or story line or character edits through off-line networks. Still other fan collections remain unshared, and the volume of content is such that no

one could watch every episode of every soap from the home-taping era on, which now spans four decades.

As a result, there are many stories, characters, programs, and individuals that do not appear in *Her Stories*. My personal history as a *General Hospital* viewer has surely shaped my insights—I simply know this soap better than any other, thanks not only to my viewing history but also to my past observational research into its production and to my access to multiple weeks of episodes across the 1960s in the UCLA Film and Television Archive.⁴³ The differences between soaps are quite significant for those familiar with them, and I am aware of the ways that *GH* is and is not a typical case at different moments in its history. As I have watched episodes (or even read sequences of outlines or scripts) for other soaps in my research, I have found myself intensely invested in their stories, as well.⁴⁴ Even as I was watching the 2000s and 2010s *GH* as it aired, often I found myself caring much more about the characters of the 1970s *Ryan's Hope* (ABC, 1975–89) or *The Doctors*, which I was viewing at the same time. I am hardly an objective observer, but *Her Stories* encompasses more than the story of any one soap, or any one viewer, myself included. Indeed, one of its lessons is that the form is internally varied enough that no one soap could represent its history.

As a way of accounting for how my arguments and areas of focus have been shaped by the available archive, I have tried to indicate through citation whether I am referencing an episode I have watched or whether my point is based on a script or story summary. I have read multiple scripts or watched a long sequence of episodes (or scenes of particular story lines) for any examples I discuss in depth. However, except for cases of episodes that are preserved in official archives or are commercially available, I do not identify how I saw particular episodes, as I do not want to endanger the accessibility of the fan-generated archives, online and off, so crucial to my work and to lay preservation. If I cite a particular episode (rather than a script, outline, or other manuscript), I have watched it.

I have been careful to identify scenes and episodes and contextual circumstances by exact date, both as part of indicating how I have reached my conclusions—what happens in what order is important to seeing how representations change over time—and to emphasize that moments of soap opera have occurred not in some ephemeral anytime but under specific historical circumstances. Attributing such moments to particular dates is a means of giving them a history, of recognizing them as particular rather than universal, as mutable rather than essential, but also as connected to specific historical forces that shaped American life in 1954, or 1988. Yet the airdates I offer

are often dependent on sources vulnerable to the inaccuracies of memory and errors of documentation, whether those of official archives and institutions or of everyday viewers. My efforts at dating soap episodes, much like the rest of my conclusions, are products of inevitably flawed research and interpretation, although they are offered in good faith, with as much rigor as one might apply to such fleeting objects.

Her Stories historicizes the daytime TV soap opera, situating a feminized form at the center of American television history. For too long, our mainstream and even our scholarly conceptions of television history have been directed by the high-profile programming of prime time while the medium's longest-running scripted series have offered up daily episodes to a deeply invested audience. Operating under the radar has long worked to the advantage of the soaps and their viewers. Daytime's dramas have grappled with social change and offered thoughtful explorations of romantic and familial relationships to an extent rarely seen in evening schedules, with controversial subject matter airing to little notice, and thereby little upset, outside their regular audiences. There is much to be learned about the aesthetic and economic histories of American television by studying the path of daytime soap opera, and much to be explored in the history of television's participation in the social construction of femininity and other categories of identity in soap opera's fictional tales and in its position amid broader industry discourses about women viewers and consumers. The US daytime TV soap opera demonstrates that television narratives and feminized popular forms may at once pleasurably satisfy desires and needs and frustratingly fall short of progressive ideals. Across the continuing history of American broadcasting, the daytime soap opera has carried such promising, and precarious, possibility.

PART I. THE NEW TV SOAP

LATE 1940S TO EARLY 1960S

This page intentionally left blank

ONE. SERIALS IN TRANSITION

From Radio to Television

Portia Faces Life had been a popular radio serial for many years, showcasing heroine Portia Blake Manning, torn between her desire to be a traditional housewife and her drive to help others in her career as an attorney. Ending its run on NBC radio in 1953, the serial was revived on television in 1954. After a brief teaser featuring Portia's friend Kathy in a troubling situation, the first episode of the TV serial opens on the Manning living room, where we see an ironing board set up in front of a television set, a basket of clothes waiting nearby. Portia enters the room, preoccupied first with a delivery, then with a squabble she must settle between her two children. Kathy enters just as Portia has turned on the TV and settled into her ironing. Not yet aware of Kathy's dilemma, Portia explains, "This way I can watch television and I don't have to run so far if Dickie and Shirley try to scalp each other."¹ This housewife will soon be pulled back into her career, as Kathy's presence portends, but for a brief moment she models the consumer culture's post-war ideal: the contented woman seamlessly combining domestic duties and daytime television viewing. Portia's effortless mix of housework and leisure could reassure the broadcasting and advertising industries, not to mention a culture guided by principles of patriarchy, that women could manage to be productive domestic workers and productive consumer-viewers, that daytime television could meet the interests of all. While *Portia's* audience may have internalized this lesson, they were also likely eager to watch the heroine crusade for justice. If they had been listening to Portia's adventures for years,

they well knew that she would again be drawn into her legal work. Being able to *see* her manage home and family as well as a career was a compelling reason to turn on the TV midafternoon, ironing board or not.

In the late 1940s, when Portia was still the heroine of a popular NBC daytime radio serial, no one expected her to depart for the new medium of television. American network radio's daily daytime serials were lucrative for their sponsors and networks and deeply integrated in the lives of their listeners. That daytime soap opera would come to TV at all, much less become economically and culturally central, was believed impossible as the two media began to converge. As one 1950 manual on broadcast writing asserted of the new medium, "A 'live' dramatic show cannot be a daily presentation."² Yet the passage of soap opera from radio to television not only happened but also helped to establish many basic practices of audiovisual production. The fits and starts of soap opera's transition demonstrate in microcosm television's inheritances from radio, as well as the ways the two media would be distinguished from one another. In the first fifteen years of the daytime television soap opera, the American TV business used soap opera to work through specific dimensions of TV production and storytelling, as well as broadcaster moneymaking, building the foundation of the emergent network era of American television history. This transition also required a reimagining of the daytime audience, specifically the housewife-viewer, whose habits would presumably change with the arrival of programming that required watching as well as listening, Portia come to life. As chapter 2 examines, between the late 1940s and the early 1960s, the broadcast industry and the culture at large would revise their ideas about the woman in the home. In concert with the soaps' stories of the problems inherent to marriage and family life, the postwar American woman and the trials she faced would be envisioned in new ways.

First, however, this chapter explores how soap opera transitioned from a radio to a TV form. In the process, the soaps laid a path for TV production and storytelling while distinguishing television from its predecessor, as well as defining the new medium in relation to the theatrical stage and the feature film. Broadcast historians have explored this transitional period, including the evolution of daytime programming, but have paid little to no attention to the specifics of soap opera therein.³ The period from the late 1940s to the early 1960s has been seen as rather insignificant to the history of the TV soap opera, and the history of the TV soap opera has been seen as rather insignificant to the radio-to-TV transition. Allen discusses the transition briefly in *Speaking of Soap Operas* and suggests the radio serial creator

Irna Phillips was dubious about moving serials to TV, an argument that discounts Phillips's substantive efforts as a TV pioneer and the ways that the TV soap developed its long-standing form in the later 1950s and early 1960s.⁴ In *What Women Watched*, Marsha Cassidy puts soap opera aside to focus on the other genres of 1950s daytime, rightly noting the prominence of those genres, but also taking Allen's quick treatment of the period to mean that soap opera was rather irrelevant to it.⁵ The fact that daytime serials remained a prominent part of the radio schedule across the 1950s has also obscured the initial development of the TV soap.⁶

Yet soap opera's transition from radio to TV and its development across early television show that in thinking about, experimenting with, and generating the form of TV soap opera, sponsors, creators, and audiences were piecing together the contours of the new medium. This chapter examines the soaps' industrial and production history in this period, highlighting two key realms: first, the development of practices of audiovisual storytelling and narrative structure for daily drama, in concert with practices being developed for scripted TV writing and production more generally, and, second, the economics of the daytime soap business as a TV-specific space. While the ways that the TV industry and the advertisers that funded it imagined the housewife-viewer—as well as the ways that the soaps told stories about women's struggles—are also crucial to this period, those matters will wait for examination in chapter 2. Here, I resuscitate the earliest years of the TV soap to demonstrate soap opera's intricate involvement in the origins of American television as a moving image storyteller and a profitable business, a medium developed in distinction to other modes of scripted narration employing visuals and/or sound.

Crafting the Earliest TV Soaps, Mid-1940s to 1951

Determining how to make a live, scripted drama, communicating through visuals as well as sound, and doing so on a daily basis was a major challenge for TV soap opera creators. While the mid-1950s through the early 1960s would be an era of refinement and specialization as the form became fully established in TV, the initial stage, from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s, was more tentative, and its earliest moments, those through 1951, were especially experimental. From the late 1940s through the early 1960s, the serials' production and creative practices would participate in molding an audiovisual grammar for the small screen.

Initial attempts at soap-like TV production in the late 1940s were short-lived and few, although to different degrees they offered steps in developing dramatic TV production methods. A single, local televising of the radio serial *Big Sister* in 1946 featured actors standing in front of a microphone reading a script—barely differentiating TV from radio.⁷ The DuMont Network did more to develop a TV soap creative practice, even as it mostly avoided daily scripted production. For one, the network trained in TV production future daytime soap directors and producers, such as Hal Cooper and Wes Kenney, who worked on early, non-soap programming.⁸ DuMont also briefly aired two serialized drama experiments. In 1946, the half-hour *Faraway Hill* aired weekly and was broadcast in the evening but was imagined as a “tele soap opera” appealing to housewives. Producer David P. Lewis integrated “stream-of-consciousness”-style voice-overs, not unlike those offered by the serials’ radio announcers, to allow the housewife to turn her eyes away for “peeling potatoes.” Still, the program experimented with visuals, including set changes, establishing shots, and some visual effects while, narratively, it tried a recapping strategy that would become a fixture of daytime TV soaps, repeating the last scene of the previous episode at the start of the next, a development that would supplant the radio serial’s story-recapping narrator.⁹ Another DuMont effort, *A Woman to Remember*, ran daily for five months in 1949, with a daytime slot for about half that time. Set backstage at a daytime radio drama and employing creative personnel from radio serials, it blurred the line between theatricality and realism as did much early prime-time TV, but did so under especially trying production conditions, hastening its demise.¹⁰

The most influential of the 1940s TV soap efforts was *These Are My Children* at NBC (1949), created by Irna Phillips in partnership with director Norman Felton. Robert Allen has argued that Phillips was reluctant to enter TV, and others have repeated his claims, but the *TAMC* project challenges this idea, centering Phillips squarely amid the emergence of the TV soap.¹¹ Phillips and Felton’s partnership also highlights the ways that the daytime soap sphere relied on a more gender-equitable blend of labor than was typical of most early TV dramatic production. Attending to visuals as well as sound, Phillips and Felton were pioneers in TV soap production, and in the evolution of scripted television more generally.¹²

As she planned *TAMC* in 1948, Phillips drew upon the lessons of radio, mindful both of the narrative utility of dialogue and of the habits of her audience, whom she sought to draw gradually toward looking as well as listening. In retrospect, it is clear that Phillips was in accord with a number

of early TV producers in recognizing the importance of sound for the new medium's storytelling capabilities, but at the time she clashed with NBC Television program manager Ted Mills on this matter, as he argued that action should overtake dialogue on TV.¹³ In seeking to build audience investment through dialogue before relying more heavily on visuals, Phillips was crafting television by attending both to narrative effectiveness and to audience expectations.¹⁴

Phillips knew how to create stories and characters, but she also required Felton's directorial skill to invent the daily TV soap. Felton used the project to outline "The Basis for a Television Production Technique"; his ideas therein shaped not only early soap production but dramatic TV production more generally, given his subsequent career in writing and directing live anthology dramas and filmed series such as *Dr. Kildare* (NBC, 1961–66).¹⁵ Like Phillips, Felton's ideas both drew upon and varied from previous models of media creation. For example, he argued for a deviation from a standard of motion picture and theater production by rejecting the practice of working with preestablished, permanent, standing sets. Instead, he urged episode-by-episode consultation between director and scene designer so that only those portions of sets necessary for any one day's production would be erected, increasing efficiency and conserving costs. Felton urged this efficiency of set use to be included in scripting, a practice that would be ongoing across soap history, continuing well into the 2010s, in order to minimize studio resets from day to day.¹⁶

Felton also proposed some prefilmed exterior shots as a way to orient the audience to the on-screen space, as well as performing preliminary character work—telling us something about the female lead by including an exterior shot of her Victorian mansion, for example.¹⁷ Soap creators would use prefilmed (later, taped) exterior shots across their history, as in the images of the Collinwood mansion in *Dark Shadows* (ABC, 1966–71), the footage of the ambulance driving up to *General Hospital* in that program's opening credits between 1978 and 1993, or the visuals of the exteriors of the Abbott and Chandler estates on *The Young and the Restless* (CBS, 1973–) in the 2010s. While Felton and NBC's Mills disagreed on some matters, they were united in believing that the look of TV drama should be different from other media; their choices for *TAMC* began to shape this TV-specific style.¹⁸

Felton's ideas about visuals were rooted in more than production efficiencies; they were also connected to the narrative and affective dimensions of the program. Along with Phillips, he understood the need to get viewers

FIGURE 1.1 Irna Phillips reviews floor plans of sets for *These Are My Children*, the first soap opera she created for television, produced in 1949 at WNBQ, Chicago. Wisconsin Historical Society
WHS-102844.



invested in the characters on-screen. It was because the emphasis of *TAMC* would be on the “dramatic working out of emotional conflicts” that he believed the production needed only minimal sets. He imagined that scenes might fade out on a close-up reaction shot of one character, obviating the necessity of seeing other characters’ exits or entrances, and thereby of more elaborated sets. The scene-ending, close-up reaction shot would become a standard of the TV soap, one Felton designed to maximize emotion while minimizing the costs of set creation and setup.¹⁹ In keeping with his investment in the visual power of TV, NBC’s Mills agreed that an emphasis on “face-to-face cutting” in sequences of “high, sustained emotion” would make for compelling viewing.²⁰

Despite Phillips’s and Felton’s efforts, NBC’s support of *TAMC* was poor, and the soap was broadcast for less than one month in 1949. This was indicative of NBC’s attitude toward daytime soaps across the 1950s, as it failed to carry out several plans for TV soap blocks, especially when it lacked guaranteed sponsors to foot the bill.²¹ In 1951 the Biow Company’s Roy Winsor offered the network a package of two sponsored serials and a third that would initially need to be sustained by the network until a sponsor was found;

NBC declined. According to Winsor, "They wanted no part of soap opera on television and certainly would contribute no free time on the air."²² CBS was more open to the TV serial during this transition period. It carried Procter & Gamble's first attempt at a TV soap, *The First Hundred Years*, in 1950, and saw the benefits of the forty-five-minute serial block Winsor was offering, which launched two long-running programs, *Love of Life* (1951–80) and *Search for Tomorrow* (1951–82; NBC, 1982–86), on the network in 1951.²³ Each of these efforts further developed the practices of TV soap production. *Hundred Years*, for example, instituted long-term contracts for its on-screen talent, based on the idea that specific performers became more essential when they could be seen on TV as well as heard, a practice that would become standard to soap production across its history.²⁴

While the TV industry logic in these early years was to create daytime programming that would allow housewives to follow along by listening rather than watching, early TV soap creators paid more attention to visual style than such logic suggests.²⁵ The earliest TV soaps evidenced these conflicting investments in the visual. Some were shot with static cameras and relied more on two-shots than on close-ups, taking the proscenium style of the theater rather literally and avoiding putting cameras deep enough into diegetic space to shoot true shot/reverse shots over characters' shoulders. But other early TV serials borrowed more from another antecedent, feature film, and employed visual devices such as the close-up from the start. The first episode of *Search for Tomorrow* in 1951 bore this out, with close-ups of key props, such as a typewriter and a child's doll, serving as indicators of character priorities and concerns, while close-ups of characters' faces, especially that of heroine Joanne Barron, communicated emotions, such as Joanne's worries about her in-laws pulling her husband away from her and their daughter.²⁶ Even radio serial specialists like Frank and Anne Hummert recognized the narrative utility of the close-up for TV serials. As they wrote while planning the first on-screen appearance of eponymous heroine Nona Brady in their never-aired TV project, "The close-up in our opinion is God's gift to the small screen of television."²⁷

Some early TV soaps also used the same visual strategies employed in nonserialized nighttime TV drama of the period, such as the in-depth staging of characters engaged in conversation who are both facing toward the camera, one character's back to the other's front.²⁸ Jonah Horwitz makes clear that this was a standard device in the nighttime anthology dramas that received so much acclaim in the early 1950s.²⁹ Daytime soaps used it, as well, as early as the first episode of *SFT* with Keith Barron in the foreground and



FIGURE 1.2 *Search for Tomorrow* used superimpositions to mimic the character Walter's (Don Knotts) dreamlike state, NBC, March 27, 1953.

his demanding father, Victor, behind him, trying to impose his vision for Keith's future on his resistant son.³⁰ This technique would eventually come to be associated largely with soap opera, but it was used widely in early TV, perhaps due to the movement of creatives such as Felton and writer Agnes Eckhardt (a protégé of Phillips's) between prime time's anthology dramas and daytime's serials.

Along with close-ups and in-depth staging, early TV serials experimented with such visual storytelling devices as reaction shots and effects meant to mimic characters' states of mind. Phillips insisted on the importance of depicting characters listening to other characters, and the Hummerts understood the dramatic utility of a reaction shot to demonstrate the male lead's instant infatuation with the heroine.³¹ Early fifties soaps used both visual and audio effects to represent characters' states of mind, from superimpositions of the toys a little girl imagines her absent father might be buying her to a wave effect mimicking a comatose character's mental activity.³² To represent the character Walter's dreamlike state, *Search for Tomorrow* used a close-up of his distraught face superimposed upon shots of Walter from behind

(portrayed by a stand-in) struggling to open a series of locked doors.³³ These visual storytelling strategies remind us that early soap creators were well aware of the new medium's differences from radio. Yet the extent to which creators would distinguish TV soaps from radio's daily dramas was a major preoccupation of this period, as all struggled to define the new medium.

Transitioning the Radio Serial

While the industrial structure for broadcast network television carried over from that established in radio, the development of the new medium in the late 1940s and early 1950s included some concern over which aspects of the radio business would remain ascendant. In particular, some in the industry and the broader society hoped that the power of sponsors would be ameliorated, and that the networks would have greater control. This stance was rooted in criticisms of radio's commercial orientation that had circulated since the 1930s both within the industry and among journalists, politicians, and intellectuals. Broadcast historian William Boddy has analyzed the links between these critiques of sponsors and commercialism and the excoriation of radio's daytime serials and their imagined female audience. He points to Charles A. Siepmann's manifesto *Radio's Second Chance* (1946), which associated the "alleged pathology of female soap listeners" with "the commercial constraints and program mediocrity that Siepmann and other broadcast reformers saw as central to the cultural and civic shortcomings of US broadcasting."³⁴ Popular screeds such as Philip Wylie's *Generation of Vipers* connected radio serials to broader critiques of American society as emasculated.³⁵ Such discourses made radio, commercialism, femininity, and daytime serials representative of the disparaged past against which the new medium of TV could be built.³⁶

As a result, early discussions of the possibility of TV soap opera either opposed sully television with radio's worst or insisted that TV soap opera would have to improve upon its radio past, that television could not abide the low quality and crass commercialism represented by the radio serials.³⁷ Once TV soaps appeared, critics often judged them according to how well they distinguished themselves from radio versions. When journalist Ann Griffith wrote to Ted Corday, director of *As the World Turns* (CBS, 1956–2010), in 1957, she praised his work by saying, "I would not have believed that the serial drama, as I have been informed the soap opera is now called, could be rescued from raucousness and dishonesty and turned into honest,

intelligent entertainment, but you have proved that it can be done and thus provided, I think, an important example of how television can grow.”³⁸ In contrast, when a critic judged a TV serial as inferior, as in the case of one 1958 review of *Kitty Foyle* (NBC), it was damned for being “no different from the misery-ridden productions aired on yesteryear’s radio channels.”³⁹

The complicated relationship between the new TV soap and its radio predecessors was shaped by these gendered cultural hierarchies, but also by more pragmatic economic concerns, such as whether daytime radio’s profitability would be harmed by TV. Even those curious about TV, like longtime radio sponsor Procter & Gamble, did not want to risk the revenue of radio, and initially kept its radio properties away. Successful radio writers, including Jane Crusinberry and Frank and Anne Hummert, contemplated bringing their dramas to television but did not ultimately do so.⁴⁰ Indeed, other than the experiment of *These Are My Children*, which was a remake of a Phillips radio serial, all of the soaps that aired on television through 1951 were original to TV. The most substantive effort to transition a radio soap came, again, from Phillips, who designed, funded, and advocated for an experimental TV production of radio’s *The Guiding Light* despite P&G’s resistance.⁴¹

As had been her position with *TAMC*, Phillips believed there was a fundamental similarity between radio and TV serials—both were about character conflict.⁴² But she struggled with how best to use video as well as audio to this end.⁴³ She began to write original scripts for the *GL* experiment and focused especially on demonstrating the storytelling power of the visual. She planned an opening scene in a bar, with sultry Gloria singing about her feelings for the married Bill Bauer, followed by a dialogue-free sequence of the desperate, alcoholic Bill tempted to take a drink. The relatively minimal dialogue included a discussion about rejecting words as a way to communicate, as well as a forbidden kiss between Gloria and Bill.⁴⁴ Realizing that an overemphasis on visuality might suggest that radio was passé, Phillips changed course—she did not want P&G, the sponsor-owners she was hoping to persuade, to panic about risking radio profits and decided to suggest a radio-TV simulcast instead.⁴⁵ Thus she decided to shoot *video* versions of two *radio* scripts.

Phillips’s pragmatism did not mean she was ignoring the visual. She planned to use just one set, divided into two settings for the two different scripts she sought to produce, keeping with the procedure of partial set use Felton had designed for *TAMC*.⁴⁶ She was thus mindful of budgetary and production efficiencies but also attentive to visual storytelling, writing long descriptions speculating about what different shot scales might communi-

cate, what viewers should see during a character's stream-of-consciousness voice-over, and how fog might be used to communicate emotion.⁴⁷ Phillips's attentiveness to the image continued once P&G eventually agreed to sponsor a TV version of *GL*. She watched the existing TV soaps and made multiple (not always welcome) suggestions to the producer and director regarding visual elements. She attended closely to actors' facial expressions and physical gestures, noting which characters should be standing or sitting in scenes as indicators of their real or imagined power over one another. She understood physical actions as expressions of character and of dramatic conflict, including arguing for the value of characters restricting their physical expressions. For example, in a scene between Meta and Bruce scripted for the program's first week on television, Phillips urged restraint, insisting that the characters should only touch once and that "sex should be present, but only in the face, the eyes. We should be made conscious of the desire of the man, but never does he manifest his desire in actual action." She was drawing upon her expertise in radio storytelling, noting that with this kind of suggestiveness, "there is so much more that can be left to the imagination of the viewer," as in radio. She also drew upon her radio experience in urging a visual equivalent of the phrases and verbal expressions particular to each character, such as distinctive hand gestures.⁴⁸

The radio and TV versions of *GL* ran concurrently as daily fifteen-minute episodes for four years but were not simulcast. The radio episodes were recorded a day in advance, serving as a read-through for the next day's live TV production. The same story, using the same scripts, proceeded in each medium, but the program was increasingly oriented toward TV. Scripts were formatted with two columns, for audio and video. The cast was expanded to make for a more manageable workload, and plot was oriented around two stories (rather than the three or four that had been typical of radio), with complications that allowed for scenes between a range of characters.⁴⁹ Actors, newly valued now that audiences could see them, were put on thirteen-week contracts that promised a certain number of episodes, the first iteration of the appearance guarantees that would remain in place across TV soap history.⁵⁰ The radio version was still viable, for a time, but the industry was orienting itself toward TV.

These shifts, and the example of *GL*, led a number of radio serials to transition to TV after 1952, some reviving a dormant radio serial, others adding a TV version to a still-running radio program. Many of these veered away from the premise or timeline of the radio programs, an effort to differentiate and update for the new medium.⁵¹ Still, many characteristics of radio serials

accompanied the soaps to tv. Some carried on a tradition of serials having metaphorical themes that offered some kind of worldview or outlook for the fictional community, as in the “guiding light” of faith and family that inspired the characters of Phillips’s creation.⁵² The new-for-tv *Golden Windows* (NBC, 1954–55) used a fable about learning to appreciate what one has rather than longing for what one does not to narrate the story of heroine Julie Goodwin, who longs to leave her home and fiancé to pursue her dreams of musical stardom. The opening credits featured a golden-windowed house and an announcer repeating the fable; the theme was reiterated in dialogue, as in Julie declaring, “It was foolish of me to think I could go and search for my golden windows.”⁵³

Golden Windows was one of several early tv soaps that used an announcer much as did radio serials. As Allen has explained, the narrator was a key element of the radio serial, transitioning between and linking the program and the commercial announcements, as well as guiding the listener through the story: “The dominant voice (both narratively and physically) of the soap opera was that of the narrator. He . . . interpreted the world of the narrative and that of the commercial message.”⁵⁴ Some tv soaps eschewed this device or drastically limited the role of the narrator. *The Guiding Light* had stopped using a narrator to recap the story or provide character insight even on radio by the time the program came to tv, and Phillips insisted that the tv *GL* use a narrator only to remind viewers that the show would return after the commercial break and the next day, a way of training audiences to tv’s rhythms.⁵⁵ Increasingly, the more interpretive narrator was associated with radio serials, not with tv, potentially opening the audiovisual text to a more flexible array of meanings, even as the cameras and shot selections worked to direct audience attention.

With or without a radio-style narrator, early tv soap writers struggled with how to communicate character psychology in ways that maximized the affordances of tv. When Crusinberry wrote potential scripts for a tv version of *The Story of Mary Marlin*, she included both a conventional narrator, commenting on the action, and characters introducing themselves via direct address.⁵⁶ While this version never came to light, one early soap, *Woman with a Past* (CBS, 1954), from radio writer Mona Kent, also had characters address the audience, breaking the fourth wall and taking on the explanatory role previously held by the narrator.⁵⁷ Such experiments did not last long. The more enduring practice would instead incorporate internal monologues, voice-overs in shots of pensive characters; Phillips saw this as a key technique for providing viewers access to a character’s inner life, one that