Oxford Handbooks Online

Abstract and Keywords

The rise of the American motion picture corresponds to the influx of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe. Just as many of these immigrants initially settled in East Coast and Midwest cities, both movies and movie audiences emerged there as an urban phenomenon. Rather than view this phenomenon only in terms of the images that films of this era offered, this chapter proposes to move beyond a "reflection paradigm" of film history. Of course, film texts reflected immigrant, ethnic, and racial identities. But these identities also existed beyond the text, across movies and movie-going, and embedded within diffuse, multiple, and overlapping networks of imagined relationships. Using Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope, this chapter recounts some preliminary case studies involving race, ethnicity, and immigration to explore how future research in this area might probe the cultural practices of movie-going among diverse audiences during the first half of the twentieth century.

Keywords: audiences, theater, movie-going, Bakhtin, chronotope, Holocaust, anti-Nazi, film, ghetto, literature

On January 24, 1916, and after weeks of advance publicity and adulatory reviews of showings in other cities, the highly acclaimed motion picture *The Birth of a Nation* (Epoch, 1915) opened for an exclusive engagement at the Majestic Theatre in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Based on Thomas F. Dixon's 1905 novel *The Clansman* and a subsequent stage adaptation, America's first motion picture blockbuster almost immediately catapulted into popular consciousness with its visual innovations and epic narrative spanning slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. Despite its reprehensible glorification of the Ku Klux Klan, the film, in Janet Staiger's words, became "encrusted with a history of responses and debates which make it a symbol of more than racist propaganda."[1] That encrustation had already begun well before the film's release in Fort Wayne, but once the film actually opened for local audiences, its immediacy created a new dimension for local audiences to make sense of the film. The *Fort Wayne Sentinel* reported that at the city premiere, "audiences burst into applause as the three thousand riders of the Klan dash down the hillside … to the rescue of their rights." Of course, the film narrative only could depict such vigilantism after it showed the Klan trying "to quell the uprising of the vicious and evil whites and the ignorant blacks." The *Sentinel* referred to the freed slave Gus in lascivious pursuit of the white Elsie Stoneman, not by name but as "a four legged beast." Yet curiously, the newspaper hailed the film adaptation as "a plea for peace" and "a particularly moving appeal" for greater understanding. It found that like Dixon's book, the film afforded "Northerners … a new viewpoint even if their fathers fought and bled in those awful years."[2] Whatever the film's "plea for peace" and understanding might have been, it engaged its audiences not through its ideological purity but through a racism mottled with pleas for tolerance and understanding. Clearly, *The Birth of a Nation* was "more than racist propaganda" for *The Fort Wayne Sentinel* as well as for those audiences deeply moved by their first encounter with the sweep and spectacle of the film.

Nearly 100 years later, the local reception of *The Birth of a Nation* beyond cities like New York still has something to tell us about immigration, race, and ethnicity in film. Films from the past can generate historical mirages for the present, not because they can do but because of what we desire them to do. Today, the public wants these films to

offer some essential expression of the past that other forms of historical evidence do not provide. For all of their seeming promise to distill some prior cultural essence, though, films of the past do not tidy up as historical evidence for the present. As a historical document, *The Birth of a Nation* alone cannot fully explain an effusive review of the local premiere of the film in both relaying that an audience cheered the KKK and in lauding the film's perceived message of tolerance. The same challenge emerges for the study of immigration, race, and ethnicity in American film. The studies of immigration, race, and ethnicity themselves are messy and full of contradictions; films from the past do not eliminate these contradictions. Any study of immigration, race, and ethnicity in film undoubtedly will contribute to this confusion, not clarify it.

Perhaps this confusion derives from the desire to use films as a way to streamline this history. Though not exclusively so, the basic premise for studying race, ethnicity, and immigration since the 1960s has presumed that film is merely a vessel, and matters of immigration, race, and ethnicity are what pour out as the contents. In other words, studying immigration, race, and ethnicity in relation to film is simply a matter of studying these identities and representations as they exist in film. Can immigration, race, and ethnicity in American film extend beyond cinematic representation to encompass, for example, studying flesh and blood audiences attending a film or even a theatrical performance?

If we return to Fort Wayne a decade before the release of *The Birth of a Nation*, there are two tantalizing press accounts of the African American audiences who clearly were not the target audience for *The Birth of a Nation*. In 1904, the *Fort Wayne Daily News* reported that a judge had thrown out a court case brought by Charles Williams against Frank E. Stouder, manager of the Masonic Temple theater, "for refusal to admit him … because he was a colored man." Almost a year later, the *Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette* reported on page 5 that a melée had occurred at the same theater:

> A party of negroes which attended the Temple theater last night came nearly spending a night at police headquarters and as a result some affidavits may be filed this morning. It seems that one swain took a strange damsel to the show and his old sweetheart was a member of the party. After the play, the old sweetheart ran up to the beau and requested a word with him. It is said he thereupon threatened to throw her down the stairs. He alleges she tore his coat. The entire company then repaired to the police station to tell of the trouble, but when the officers threatened to lock them up they dispersed.

Neither story had anything to do with images in film nor even with movie-going; in both cases, the incidents presumably took place at stage performances. Yet such accounts raise some useful and relevant questions. Were African Americans regularly refused admission to movie theaters? Did they often attend the theater in Fort Wayne, and, if so, did they also attend the films frequently screened as early as 1897 at these venues? How did both white and black audiences attend the theater? Did these audiences sit together or separately, and did they choose where they sat, or did the theater determine seating? Did the theater regularly refuse admission to African Americans or only occasionally? Were these newspaper accounts part of an attempt to diminish and marginalize African American spectatorship, perhaps a way to reinforce the kinds of images of African Americans depicted in films like *The Birth of a Nation*? Were these stories just anomalies? Was the latter story perhaps an ingenious ruse fabricated by the theater to help provide additional publicity for its current dramatic offering?

With their sketchy accounts of an African American audience, these early newspaper reports highlight how little we know of race as well as ethnicity and immigration as they relate to film. Here, we might reflect on these identities not just as images but also as a complex cultural network inclusive of the multiple dimensions of popular entertainment. Also, we might consider how this network included not just films themselves but also audiences who attended these films. What did movie-going as a cultural practice mean in the first half of the twentieth century? How did intertextual networks of literature, stage, journalism, and other films both open and limit potential ways to make sense of these films? How might racial, ethnic, and immigrant identities have mattered to the actual process of movie-making?

Furthermore, approaching immigration, race, and ethnicity as these topics relate to film must address how these relationships have changed over time and in spaces devoted to popular entertainment. As both Vivian Sobchak and Robert Stam have observed, Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of the chronotope—a configuration of textual motifs along a time-space continuum—remains uniquely suited to film analysis. Bakhtin describes the chronotope where "time … thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the

movements of time, plot and history."[3] Immigration, race, and ethnicity likewise do not remain static and immutable constructs and likewise become "charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history."[4] Their presence in film, as well as their relation to the entirety of the social context for movie-going, constitutes its own chronotope playing out across the changing dimensions of movie-going that occurred in both time and in identifiable spaces dedicated to leisure and entertainment. The chronotope need not exist only in the text. It also can map out the thickening and increasingly visible set of relationships between texts and specific audiences charged with and responsive to movements taking place in both space and time.

The chronotope of immigration, race, and ethnicity in relation to film can reveal a great deal about the multidimensional and hybridized nature of this cultural complex. The concept of race meant one thing at the beginning of the twentieth century, perhaps a vague concept that conflated biology with national origin. By the 1920s and 1930s, and with the advent of eugenics and race science, it meant something quite different: race was a scientific but nonetheless arbitrary construction organizing allegedly biological traits, especially as a way to legally and socially subordinate specific groups. Along with the treatment of immigrant and ethnic groups, race could powerfully reinforce existing attitudes—or create new ones—justifying socioeconomic disparities and orders. In more limited and contentious ways, it could help ameliorate the consequences of socioeconomic subordination.

As social constructs, immigration, race, and ethnicity have considerable overlap with one another. Each is itself hybridized and thus inflects what movie-going might mean to diverse audiences. As its own construct, the concept of ethnicity today is probably closer to how people used to discuss race: simply as a way to conceive of commonalities between various groups on the basis of religion, culture, and national origin. Immigration became a way to conceive of these groupings in terms of people displaced and dispersed from their homeland. African American theatergoers thus shared a common bond as an ethnic group, but social constructs simultaneously racialized their image both in films as well as in their belonging to an audience. Just as the connotations of immigration, race, and ethnicity have changed continuously over time, so too have the cultural practices of attending a show. The press accounts of African American theater-going and the city premiere of *The Birth of a Nation* some ten years after those reports already mark shifts taking place locally, both in cinematic depictions of race as well as in the cultural practice of being part of an audience. Occurring at various rates of change and scale, the dynamic relationship between film and immigration-race-ethnicity happens not just at the macro level of social and cultural trends but also at a local level that has its own distinct textures and inflections as well.

Is a Holocaust Film a Jewish Film?

The shifting parameters of what race, ethnicity, and immigration might mean to movies and movie-going help delineate the multidimensional and multitemporal nature of this relationship. Newspapers helped construct a reading position for audiences that could at once invoke the mode of melodrama as audiences cheered the Klan chasing down "a four legged beast," yet also identify a message in the film of tolerance and understanding. A decade earlier, press accounts described, however incompletely, the practice of African American theater-going. To understand a shifting set of parameters for what immigration, race, and ethnicity in relation to film might mean, one must look beyond only cinematic images. As a chronotope, the relationships, spaces, and contexts between and within which audiences consumed these images continually shifted and changed. These relationships and contexts included who saw these films, where they saw them, how people understood movie-going as a cultural practice, the connections audiences made between films and other kinds of popular entertainment, and, finally, how audiences understood cultural identity as a part of the movie-making process itself.

If the texture and inflection of the local community emerges as one site among many to examine the chronotope of how film exists in a relationship to immigration, race, and ethnicity, another potential site involves the popular practice of cataloging and inventorying images depicting immigration, race, and ethnicity. To illustrate the need to reflect upon the culturally constructed nature of this practice, let us jump ahead some thirty years to consider this deceptively simple question regarding ethnicity and film: is a Holocaust film necessarily a Jewish film? The answer is not so simple. Does this body of films include only features depicting recognizably Jewish characters or overtly addressing the Holocaust and Nazi anti-Semitism? Anti-Nazi films of the 1930s and 1940s had few identifiably Jewish characters but were rich with contextual meanings readily identifiable to Jewish audiences. In many cases, non-theatrical titles screened only in churches, schools, and the military went further than feature films in addressing the Holocaust and Nazi anti-Semitism. Limiting study to only overt depictions excludes films not

necessarily Jewish but specifically marketed to Jewish audiences, or films that were popular with these audiences. In other cases, audiences widely understood films such as *The Life of Emile Zola* (Warner Bros., 1937) to be about Nazi anti-Semitism, even though the biopic ostensibly is about the nineteenth-century French novelist and his involvement in the Dreyfus Affair, a well-known incident of French anti-Semitism. Like *Zola*, films made by Jewish creative personnel during this period frequently lacked overt depictions of Jewish characters or themes but certainly made evocative and implicit references to them.

Because the basic question, "what is a Jewish film?" engenders such varied and protean responses, this chapter moves beyond only cataloging these films and considers a multifaceted approach to the topic. This approach must account for movie-going in all of its dimensions. More than viewing images of Jews or the Holocaust, it involves overlapping methods of textual analysis, production history, and audience reception. Not only do we need a normative framework that seeks to expand the canon of "usual suspects" but one that also seeks to expand our definitions of what studying movie-going in relation to ethnicity—as well as immigration and race—might involve. For each mediated text, these norms include evaluating each film on the basis of the following criteria:

- Significance of artistic achievement
- Facticity and authenticity of representation
- Influence upon subsequent films and genres
- Notable conditions of production, such as on-location shooting or use of survivor reenactments
- Critical reception at the time of release
- Influence upon audiences and subsequent audience expectations regarding how to represent Judaism, anti-Semitism, and the Holocaust

Establishing a transparent set of conventions for discussing the impact and qualities of Holocaust as well as other films involving ethnicity, race, and immigration potentially opens new possibilities for which films and what aspects of them merit discussion. Rather than rely upon a relatively limited canon established mostly through popular reviews or auteurist scholarship, these discussions might focus more on the material forces establishing that canon. If we can discuss artistic achievement on a par with facticity and authenticity, for example, we can appreciate a relatively low-budget film such as *The Last Stop* (Times, 1948), shot on location at Auschwitz by a team of female survivors. Neither ignoring nor dwelling upon a specifically Jewish dimension of Nazi anti-Semitism, this foreign film was, for many American audiences, the first encounter, after documentary newsreels, with a Holocaust film.

If some discussions regarding Holocaust-themed films involve more than considering what makes these titles "great masterpieces," others alternatively focus upon decidedly mimetic and ethical questions regarding how well these mediated representations performed. Are they "realistic?" Do they engage in stereotypes? Do they, in Lawrence Langer's words, "universalize" the Holocaust into a series of digestible yet banal lessons for us to learn?[5] Or worse, do they trivialize the Holocaust as a form of mere entertainment? Just as questions of aesthetic value and canon inclusion have no permanent resolution, questions of mimesis and representational ethics are impermanent because our norms and conventions for what constitutes a "realistic" or "ethical" treatment also remain in flux. Upon release, anti-Nazi and Holocaust "comedies" routinely generated controversy over tastelessness, but films such as *To Be or Not to Be* (United Artists, 1940), *The Producers* (AVCO, 1967), and, more recently, *Life Is Beautiful* (1997; Miramax, 1998), all eventually merited places, albeit ones subject to continued contestation, in the canon of anti-Nazi and Holocaust-themed films and, in some cases, even Jewish-themed ones.

Although both aesthetic and mimetic approaches to these films will and should continue to discuss and debate the merits of individual films, these discussions should not operate to the exclusion of a more systematic approach to considering how these films represent Holocaust and Jewishness, or how actual audiences might have perceived these representations. Tastes change; standards of realism shift according to conventions of the time; and methods of evaluating a film, whether by director, genre, or individual film, all come into and out of style. If the study of Holocaust and Jewish films is to maintain credibility, it must be able to historicize and account for these shifts rather than simply perpetuate or naturalize them.

In addition to moving beyond the established practice of attempting to inventory these films, we also must move beyond what I call the "reflection paradigm." Annette Insdorf's groundbreaking *Indelible Shadows* offers a telling

example of just how difficult it is to define a Holocaust film. The films included in her survey are not Holocaust films but are films that stand in relation to the Holocaust. Defining the Holocaust film as that which "illuminates, distorts, confronts, or reduces the Holocaust," Insdorf explores this relationship thematically, in terms of "cinematic language," "narrative strategies," depictions of Nazi atrocities, and, finally, those films that shape "documentary material through a personal voice."[6] Maintaining this distinction between the totality of an event that can never submit fully to representation and the representation itself has a long and respected tradition which we should continue to observe. But how does this tradition help us to make sense of a science fiction action adventure film like *X-Men* (Twentieth Century-Fox, 2000), with its opening explicitly set in a Nazi death camp? As Lawrence Baron has noted, some critical responses concluded that this was yet another trivialization of the Holocaust. Baron's essay argued, however, that the film functions on multiple levels, appealing to a teenage male audience while simultaneously reflecting allegorical connections between the Jewish-American experience and dialectical anxieties over state-sanctioned discrimination in both the United States as well as in Nazi Germany. Baron noted that the comic books on which the film is based are even more explicit in making these connections.[7] Clearly, no one looks to *X-Men* for an accurate depiction of a concentration camp. But can we so easily dispense with its allegory or its complex networks of historical meaning simply because it comes from a comic book and appears to trivialize the Holocaust in ways that higher-brow documentary and fiction does not?

The identity politics of what constitutes a Jewish film move us even further from a clear answer to this deceptively simple question. Lester Friedman's *Hollywood's Image of the Jew*, a 1982 pioneering study of representations of Jews in American film, made a similar argument as did Insdorf: film exists in relation to the American Jewish experience rather than embodying some part of that experience. To understand Jewish film, one has to understand "how Jews had been portrayed in American films." These portrayals, in turn, "could say something about Jews as well as about Americans."[8] Two years after the publication of Friedman's book, Patricia Erens proposed a more systematic, genre-oriented framework to examine representations of Jews in American cinema. Like Friedman, she conceived of film narratives as "incorporating Jewish elements" that "relate to American society in general and to the American-Jewish community in particular." And, like Friedman, she argued that these films reflect something of "actual experiences and latent attitudes" both toward and among the Jewish community.[9]

Insdorf, Friedman, and Erens all staked out an important and necessary distinction at a time when film studies still had to achieve respect as an academic discipline: the cinematic representation is not interchangeable with the thing represented. Furthermore, being able to distinguish between cinematic depictions and what those depictions represent can yield greater insight into protean subjects like the Holocaust or Jewish identity. And while these pioneering works have their limitations, as any scholarship has, they helped establish a paradigm for analyzing film as reflection. This chapter thus is not so much a critique of that paradigm as it is an attempt to rethink a different set of possibilities outside the reflection paradigm.

The Life of Emile Zola (Warner Bros., 1937) illustrates the limitations of this paradigm. Does it constitute a Jewish film? Is it an anti-Nazi film? Does the film provide an example of how Hollywood treated anti-Semitism? Except for a single fleeting close-up of the word "Jew" appearing in a shot, the film makes no explicit reference to Zola's involvement in combating anti-Semitism during the infamous Dreyfus Affair. Yet in depicting an event that audiences absolutely would have recognized as being about the infamous Dreyfus affair, Warner Bros. actively marketed the film to Jewish audiences and encouraged them to draw the topical and relevant parallels to contemporary Europe. The problem is not that there is a "reflection" paradigm. The problem is that this dominant paradigm cannot fully account for what *The Life of Emile Zola* actually did with audiences in 1937. And yet for Holocaust- and Jewish-themed films, the reflection paradigm operates largely to the exclusion of other production- or audience-oriented paradigms that might better explain what audiences did with films like *The Life of Emile Zola*.

Immigration and the Hollywood Question

The Life of Emile Zola demonstrates how the reflection paradigm as a dominant mode of studying immigration, race, and ethnicity in film can only account for explicit representations. Within the chronotope of immigration, race, and ethnicity in relation to film, the paradigm cannot account for the range of meanings that immigrant and ethnic audiences could have assigned to them, or the ways in which motion picture studios attempted to market these films to specific audiences. In addition, as Fort Wayne African American spectatorship and the exhibition of *The Birth of a Nation* in the city demonstrated, issues of race—and, by extension, immigration, and ethnicity—extended

well beyond cinematic representation to suffuse a divergent set of practices and meanings characterizing spectatorship.

Because immigrant identity is the most hybridized among race and ethnicity, as a part of the chronotope of film in relation to these identities, its discussion poses some distinct challenges. Immigrants never are just immigrants alone; they are immigrants plus something else. In relation to film, immigration almost always involves discussions of race and/or ethnicity as well. It is possible, nevertheless, to discuss race and racism or ethnicity and ethnic groups without discussing immigration. Any discussion of immigration in film, therefore, must account for how perceptions of immigration frequently express overlapping attitudes regarding race and ethnicity.

My book, *Hollywood and Anti-Semitism*, demonstrates that fears of immigration stoked what I called the "Hollywood Question." A stock set of ethnic and even racialized Jewish stereotypes, the Hollywood Question was more than just representations in films, though it certainly included those images. The Hollywood Question encompassed a whole set of social and cultural issues articulated beyond film, expressing its fears and desires through popular literature, debates over censorship, political cartoons, legislative testimony, and other discursive modes. The Hollywood Question only explicitly conveyed anti-Semitic attitudes on occasion. More often, it politely questioned whether Jews working within the film industry suffered too greatly from their immigrant parvenu backgrounds and ethnic motivations to handle the great responsibility of arriving at the helm of the most powerful media industries of public influence.

The film industry, of course, responded to this widespread perception of ethnic motivation in a variety of allusive ways, for to confront it directly would have given these perceptions additional credibility. One way to gauge the industry response to the Hollywood Question is to examine its depictions of the immigrant and the ghetto. In "Wretched Refuse: Watching New York Ethnic Slum Films in the Aftermath of 9/11," I argued that along with Richard Slotkin's frontier myth, "the myth of the city as a cramped, stifling breeding ground for antisocial and even pathological behavior has blinded us to the additional consequences of suburban revolutions, the rise of transnationalism, and the forces of globalization."[10] The essay argued that two United Artists films, *Street Scene* (1931) and *Dead End* (1937), represented paradigmatic shifts popularizing the view of the immigrant ghetto as a harsh, filthy, and animalistic environment of human beings inhumanely crowded into tenements. Despite the potential for sordid narrative details, both films possessed extraordinary cultural pedigree. Adapted from a Pulitzer Prize-winning play by Elmer Rice, *Street Scene* featured the familiar trope of an Irish-Jewish romance, set amid the harsh, violent, and even murderous conditions of the ghetto. Thematically and stylistically similar to *Street Scene*, *Dead End* self-consciously engaged social issues through its recombination of these elements with the gangster film. Also adapted from a popular Sidney Kingsley play by fellow playwright Lillian Hellman, *Dead End* was justly celebrated for its elaborate recreation of the Lower East Side on a studio soundstage.

In addition to drawing upon the prestige of their origins as well-respected plays, both *Street Scene* and *Dead End* operated squarely within the conventions of the social-problem film genre. Rather than indict the immigrants themselves, both films asserted that the harsh living conditions depicted were what bred such undesirable behaviors. The notion that one could take the immigrant out of the ghetto, but never the ghetto out of the immigrant, easily transplanted itself into popular literature *about* Hollywood. In Budd Schulberg's classic Hollywood novel, *What Makes Sammy Run?*, the book's narrator, Al Mannheim, answered the eponymous question by returning to the Lower East Side, the "breeding ground for the predatory germ that thrived in Sammy's blood, leaving him one of the most severe cases of the epidemic."

Novels like *What Makes Sammy Run* offer a kind of codex to decipher how films like *Street Scene* and *Dead End* depict immigrants. The immigrant ghetto represented the antithesis of assimilation for which many American Jews strove. When Mannheim visited Sammy's birthplace, he only could imagine

> Sammy Glick rocking in his cradle of hate, malnutrition, prejudice, suspicions, amorality, the anarchy of the poor; I thought of him as a mangy little puppy in a dog-eat-dog world. I was modulating my hate for Sammy Glick from the personal to the societal. I no longer even hated Rivington Street but the idea of Rivington Street, all Rivington Streets of all nationalities allowed to pile up in cities like gigantic dung heaps smelling up the world, ambitions growing out of filth and crawling away like worms.

As I argued in "Wretched Refuse," the logical consequence of such attitudes was the physical erasure of human "dung heaps" and, in their place, urban renewal projects like the World Trade Center, which, in this case,

obliterated Little Syria, a once-thriving Arab neighborhood that was the oldest Middle Eastern Muslim-Christian community in the United States. Built atop a haphazard patchwork of ethnic immigrant urban neighborhoods and markets, such revitalization projects destroyed the so-called ghetto and, in its place, erected modern, sleek, and streamlined architectural monuments to a burgeoning internationalism, modernity, technocracy, and global capital.

The topic of immigration, race, and ethnicity in film obviously encompasses much more than a single chapter can cover. What is offered here is a different way of thinking about these topics, considering the texture and flavor of what movie-going might have been for diverse audiences and how this experience was mediated through other activities, like attending a play or reading literature. I have also suggested some strategies to move beyond the limits of canonical films that are often discussed because of their explicit representations. Instead, we might do well to consider the multiple meanings and interpretations diverse audiences could have derived from a wider range of films that may or may not have explicitly depicted immigration, race, or ethnicity. And finally, I have suggested that the depiction of immigrants in film may have operated as part of a larger discourse that negotiated perceptions of Hollywood as being essentially ethnic and immigrant.

Other scholarship would do well to explore further the chronotope of immigration, race, and ethnicity in relation to film. Although this chapter does not address depictions of other groups, such as Asians or Native Americans, studying film in relation to these groups also can move beyond the reflection paradigm and consider how such images operated within the political economy of the film industry according to production, distribution, and exhibition. We also might consider how criticism of stereotypes in film at the time helped mediate audience interpretations. Additional scholarship might further explore the relationships between a film like *The Birth of a Nation* and other live performances, such as minstrel shows or the use of blackface. How did immigration, race, and ethnicity operate within the Hollywood industrial mode of production? How did representations of immigrants, race, and ethnicity draw from intertextual sources, such as theater and literature? How did the industry work to exclude stereotypes and regulate ethnic representations? How did attitudes toward other ethnic groups, such as Germans immediately after World War I, influence popular perceptions of the film industry? How did practices such as segregation or publicity for specific films regulate audiences and how audiences assigned meaning? How did specific genres inflect common themes of immigration, race, and ethnicity? And finally, how did films other than the Hollywood feature depict immigration, race, and ethnicity? In addition to the work of independent African American filmmakers such as Oscar Micheaux, a variety of short subjects and non-theatrical films also existed. Much scholarship already has begun to address a number of these issues and continues to question established paradigms of where to look and what to see when studying immigration, race, and ethnicity in film.

Bibliography

Carr, Steven Alan. *Hollywood and Anti-Semitism: A Cultural History Up to World War II.* Cambridge Studies in the History of Mass Communication. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Schulberg, Budd. *What Makes Sammy Run?* 1941. New York: Random House, 1952.

Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600–1860.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973.

Sobchak, Vivian. "Lounge Time: Postwar Crises and the Chronotope of Film Noir." In *Refiguring American Film Genres: Theory and History*, edited by Nick Browne, 129–170. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998.

Stam, Robert. "Palimpsestic Aesthetics: A Meditation on Hybridity and Garbage." In *Performing Hybridity*, edited by May Joseph and Jennifer Natalya Fink, 59–78. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Notes:

([1]) Janet Staiger, *Interpreting Films: Studies in the Historical Reception of American Cinema* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 139.

([2]) "A Wonderful Picture, The Birth of a Nation," *The Fort Wayne Sentinel*, Jan. 25, 1916, 6.

(3) Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes Toward a Historical Poetics," *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981), 86.

(4) Ibid., 86.

(5) Lawrence J. Langer, *Preempting the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 8–10.

(6) Annette Insdorf, *Indelible Shadows: Film and the Holocaust*, 3rd ed. (1983; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), xvi.

(7) Lawrence Baron, "X-Men as J Men: The Jewish Subtext of a Comic Book Movie," *Shofar* 22 (1) (2003): 45–46.

(8) Lester D. Friedman, *Hollywood's Image of the Jew* (New York: Ungar, 1982), xviii.

(9) Patricia Erens, *The Jew in American Cinema* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), xi.

(10) Steven Alan Carr, "Wretched Refuse: Watching New York Ethnic Slum Films in the Aftermath of 9/11," in *The City That Never Sleeps: New York and the Filmic Imagination*, ed. Murray Pomerance (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2007), 231.

Steven Carr

Steven Carr, Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne.