



The Library
UC SAN DIEGO

Racism in German and American Cinema of the Twenties

From The Ancient Law to The Jazz Singer

October 24, 2019

1 hour, 15 minutes

Speaker: Charles Musser

Moderator: Frank Mecklenburg

Transcribed by: Rachel E Lieu

[Holocaust Living History Workshop](#)

UC San Diego Library Digital Collections

<https://library.ucsd.edu/dc/object/bb5056206q>

Copyright: Under copyright (US)

Rights Holder: UC Regents

Use: This work is available from the UC San Diego Library. This digital copy of the work is intended to support research, teaching, and private study.

Constraint(s) on Use: This work is protected by the U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S.C.). Use of this work beyond that allowed by "fair use" requires written permission of the UC Regents.

Responsibility for obtaining permissions and any use and distribution of this work rests exclusively with the user and not the UC San Diego Library. Inquiries can be made to the UC San Diego Library program having custody of the work.

Time Transcription

00:00 Read Write Think Dream / The Library / UC San Diego / Channel /
www.uctv.tv/library-channel

00:09 Frank Mecklenburg: I want to introduce the speaker, Professor Charles Musser is from Yale University. He is a professor of American Studies focused on film and theater and media studies and he has published many books, um, and, um, is specialized on the American, uh, cinema world uh with his first book, *The Emergence of Cinema: the American Screen to 1907* which was published in 1990, and um a title that maybe has, is ringing bells, *Before the Nickelodeon* and various other titles that also deal with the American, African-American experience. He is also a documentary filmmaker and has done a number of things that are really contributing, uh, to the history of film in America, and I want to give this over to Professor Charles Musser. Thank you.

01:30 Charles Musser: Thank you very much Frank and, and I just want to also thank Susanne Hillman, Deborah Hertz for bringing me here today, inviting me to give this presentation really on the complexities of cinematic adaptation, specifically the ways in which *The Jazz Singer* is a secret remake of, uh, the German film *The Ancient Law, Der Alte Geist*, and uh, in which the son of a rabbi leaves the shtetl and becomes a Shakespearean actor in the 19th century Vienna. It's also about the need, I think, to avoid bad cultural history and so rescue Al Jolson from an unjust characterization, as a deeply and profound racist. And uh, this is sort of, uh, I think a quote to start off with from the black press, the *New York Amsterdam News* that uh, it seems superfluous to say anything about Al Jolson. He's beyond all doubt one of the world's greatest entertainers. He's the one white man who performs blackface in such a manner that every colored performer is proud of him. Of course, Deborah and her colleagues have their own interests around these two films, questions of assimilation, antisemitism, and racism in Germany, as well as the United States - topics which I'm far from an expert on. So it's really fortunate that we have a panel to conclude this talk; so I look forward to that.

02:48 Charles Musser: This image, of course, is from *The Jazz Singer* starring Al Jolson. Usually considered the first talkie, it was the first feature film to use synchronous sound in which actors talked and sang. It was a huge hit in the United States, and Al Jolson's first words on camera - you ain't heard nothing yet - has often been seen as emblematic of what was to follow, so far as American cinema is concerned. And yet, one cannot but acknowledge that this film has become a bad object for both serious film scholars and the general public. It's a film, I think, that's worth our attention and reassessment. *The Jazz Singer* has become demonized as a racist text and watching it has become the guiltiest and most problematic of pleasures. When an 80th anniversary DVD set was released *Entertainment Weekly's* Steve Daly savaged the film remarking that there's an ugly stereotype under wraps here - for Jolson has spent a significant portion of his of *Jazz Singer* in blackface

masquerading as an African-American man - that is, as a grotesque degrading approximation of one. In the process, he blunted his own racial heritage - a term used freely at the time to discuss Jewish identity - by assuming the trappings of another. The gimmick helped make him a recording superstar...and pigeonholed him forever inside an indefensible minstrel show tradition. At the end of his review, Daly concluded, thankfully, history has moved beyond this movie and its attitudes. How sobering to be reminded that something so wrong could ever have been so popular.

04:23 Charles Musser: Of course, we have the Governor of Virginia finding himself in, in deep water for having worn blackface when he was in medical school so it, uh, continued, uh, for much longer than many of us had thought. However popular and reductive, Daly's review echoes the point of view of Michael Rogin's devastating analysis of the film in his renowned study, *Blackface, white noise*. Although there's much that's interesting in Rogin's analysis, in the end, it's not only symptomatic, a symptomatic psychoanalytic reading of the film, it's a hysterical one, and sometimes contradictory, and even wrong. *The Jazz Singer*, Rogin declared, does not, does no favor to blacks. The blackface jazz singer is neither a jazz singer nor black. Just as *Birth of a Nation* offers a regeneration through violence, so the grinning *Jazz Singer* minstrelsy [mask] kills blacks with kindness. Likewise, Rogin's assertion that the film fails to acknowledge many of the realities of Jewish life leads to him to conclude that antisemitism is *The Jazz Singer's* structuring absence. The visible cost it leaves behind is borne by Jolson as he plays not a Jew but a black. Moreover, *The Jazz Singer* blacks out the non-Jewish group behind the black[face] mask. The lips that speak Jack's personal voice are caricatured racist icons. *The Jazz Singer* rises by putting on the mask of a group that must remain immobile, unassimilable, and fixed at the bottom.

05:52 Charles Musser: As a result of Rogin's litany of outrages, *The Jazz Singer* has come to be seen as a concentrated expression of American racism in Hollywood movies. Given Rogin's assessment, we might reasonably ask how *The Jazz Singer* and Al Jolson were received in the black community. After all, the black press was quite sophisticated and vigilant, to the degree that was possible, when it came to the issues of race and representation in the 1920s and 1930s. As I've already hinted in the epigraph to this talk, Al Jolson and *The Jazz Singer* were in bar, were embraced by black newspapers and moviegoers in the late 1920s. When top-end black theaters converted to sound - which was usually in 1928 - *The Jazz Singer* was almost always the first feature-length talkie to be shown. In Washington DC advertisements for the Republic Theatre declared that *The Jazz Singer* on the Vitaphone was being held over for a second great week in April of 1928. The holdover, the holdover occurred because no picture ever shown has gained the favorable comments such as *The Jazz Singer* has during its run at the Republic. Young and old alike have expressed their enthusiasm in tears and laughter as *The Jazz Singer* unfolds its great story. To see and to hear Al Jolson sing and talk is a

thrill that perhaps comes once in a lifetime. For your own comfort attend the matinee shows if possible; so as to avoid the night crowds.

- 07:14 Charles Musser: Less this be dismissed as ballyhoo, a short article by Felix Walker in the same paper went each performer of *The Jazz Singer* rouses the audience to wide outbursts of enthusiasm, expressed by tears, laughter, or cheers... It is unique. Tremendous. Unforgettable. Four weeks later the Republic Theatre offered a return engagement that lasted a full week, at a time when the venue showed most films for only two or three days. *The Singing Fool*, *The Singing Fool*, Jolson's next film, also had a two-week run after many thousands couldn't get in the Republic to see this picture during its first week's engagement. In Philadelphia, the Vitaphone sound version was shown at the Royal Theater in June of 1928, followed by Jolson in *The Singing Fool* at the Pearl Theatre in February of 1929. The two were brought back for an Al Jolson week in April of 1929 - including a midnight show on Sunday night of *The Jazz Singer*. This was done owing to the insistent public demand. Not only had *The Jazz Singer* created a sensation that had never been equaled by the picture of this type, but *The Singing Fool* broke all records when last shown at the Pearl and thousands were unable to gain admission to see the famous singing and talking success.
- 08:31 Charles Musser: This enthusiasm was not just a response to a new technological marvel, that of talking pictures, Jolson had repeatedly collaborated with musicians, singers, writers, and so forth, from the African-American community. He had discovered Garland Anderson, who wrote the first full-length drama by an African-American on Broadway. The process of discovery also involved providing financial support and promoting Garland to his friends in the theater world. He also discovered the band leader Eddie Elkins whom he brought to LA [Los Angeles], brought from LA to New York. Although Jolson did not play a black character in *The Jazz Singer*, he did this in the musical comedy *Big Boy*. As the jockey Gus, he encountered repeated efforts to prevent him from racing in the Kentucky Derby, foregrounding the racial exclusion that black jockeys were increasingly faced, increasingly faced at that time. According to *The New York Times*, the most remarkable scene of this hugely successful *Big Boy* was when Jolson sang spirituals with members of a black choir. Not only did the show hire an all-color combination of 10 musicians - itself un-unusual - but contrary to the usual arrangement, the band was placed on the stage and not in the pit.
- 09:51 Charles Musser: And I should point out that this is before Paul Robeson actually started his stage career singing spirituals. Uh, so, so, Al Jolson was really at the forefront of what became an important movement. Here blackface did not replace black bodies; it promoted them and allowed bonds of conviviality across racial lines. There's not time here to fully analyze Jolson's performance style but one key to his success was his ability to go in and out of character. One moment he was Al Jolson, the Jewish performer. The next he was the, in the role of the African-American

jockey. He was crisscrossing and playfully demolishing the color line which Jim Crow Laws did their best to maintain and reinforce. To further his critique of Jolson, Rogin claimed that Jews had almost entirely taken over blackface by the early 20th century. He's suggesting here that African-Americans had rejected a practice they found demeaning, while Jolson and other Jewish comedians, such as Eddie Cantor, resisted. However, even a casual look at the black press in the late 1920s shows that this is not the case. The use of blackface remained a well-established convention among African-American comedians. When blackface comedian Sammie Russell, also known as Bilo, played the Gibson Standard Theatre in Philadelphia in May 1928, he was billed as the funniest man on earth. Sandy Burns, also known as Ashes, came to Philadelphia with a company of comedians six, six weeks later. Above a picture of Burns in blackface, a newspaper advertisement likewise ballyhooed Ashes as the world's greatest comedian.

11:35 Charles Musser: By early 1929 Burns and Russell had joined forces as Ashes and Bilo, and we're touring with a company of 35 people. If the above assessment makes sense, then by putting on blackface Jolson can be understood as putting on the mask of theater, specifically American theater, as much as the mask of race. *The Jazz Singer* can be said to be about many things, but one of the most fundamental is the struggle between tradition and modernity, between religion and secular public culture; that is between the church or synagogue and the theater, between dress and rituals of worship, and the dress and rituals of entertainment and popular culture. The law of the father is replaced by the law of the theater; that the show must go on, and perhaps some certain caveats, like there's no business like show business. People in the theater came from many religions, with different customs, backgrounds, and beliefs. One had only to look at those who performed in front of Edison's kinetograph camera in 1894 to gain a glimpse of this world. They were from every part of the globe: American Indians, Japanese, British, Germans, French, Arabs, Irish-Americans, African-Americans, Mexicans, Latin Americans, South Sea Islanders, and so forth. In joining the theater, these performers joined an alternative secular religion, one that accepted anyone provided they shared that one commitment and belief that the show must go on.

13:00 Charles Musser: So here's uh, uh Imperial, uh Japanese dancers, uh who were, appear before the kinoscope, kinetograph. Um, so by the 1890s the, what was on the American stage was incredibly diverse in its, in its background. The mask of theater and the nature of performance allows the Jolson character, and others, to escape from the timeless, unchanging role they were expected to become, they were expected to become and perform, the role of Cantor. The theater frees Jackie Rabinowitz, now known as Jack Robin, and allows him to become a modern and an American. This does not mean that this mask enables him to escape the defining issues of race and ethnicity, quite the opposite. By putting on this mask, the mask of theater, by becoming part of America and its public culture, he enters into a world where the color line becomes a conflicted and pressing issue. Identity has particular

kinds of instability on the stage and in the movies. Like his character in *The Jazz Singer*, Al Jolson was the son of a Cantor and rabbi who was born with the name Asa Yoelson. There's a correspondence here but both the actors, that is Jolson's, and the character's Jackie Robin used blackface differently from the kind of acting in blackface that D.W. Griffith was using in the 1920s. Griffith had white actors fully assuming the role of black maids and butlers in *One Exciting Night* from 1922 and *White Rose* from 1923. These were for comic relief and certainly, they were demeaning. Al Jolson was always Al Jolson - Jackie Robin in blackface. He was never putting on the mask to become an entirely different character in *The Jazz Singer*.

- 14:50 Charles Musser: Let us further consider some of the other characters in *The Jazz Singer* for instance Jackie Rabinowitz's parents. Cantor Rabinowitz was played by Jewish [Swedish] -born Warner Oland who played a wide variety of ethnic and racial roles, many in yellowface. Oland immersed himself thoroughly in the Talmud and kindred Jewish writings in order to properly play the Cantor. Sarah Rabinowitz was played by the Catholic French-Canadian actress Eugenie Besserer. Correspondingly Jackie Robin was romancing shiksa Mary David, Mary Dale, a nice WASPy [white-Angle-Saxon-Protestant] girl but played by Catholic May McAvoy. So there were different forms of cross-ethnic and racial mobility, of multi-faceted boundary crossings going on here. *The Jazz Singer* depicts ethnic racial and cultural mobility at a point when, in fact, African-Americans were themselves feeling a new sense of mobility, freedom, and possibility - particularly in the realm of culture and theater with dramatic actors such as Charles Gilpin and Paul Robeson starring in Broadway productions, as well as appearing in race films.
- 15:59 Charles Musser: This mobility, limited as it was in practice, found fantasmatic expression in black spectatorship. As James Snead suggests, it's not true that we identify only with those in a film whose race or sex we share. Rather the filmic space is subversive in allowing an almost polymorphically perverse oscillation between possible roles, creating a radically broad freedom of identification. Black audiences were not simply sutured into some kind of ideal, of some kind of ideological cultural trap. With black/white collaborations occurring on the stage and in film, racial and ethnic categories seem more permeable and unstable. James Baldwin put it somewhat differently: no one, I read somewhere, a long time ago, makes his escape personality black. That the movie star is an escape personality indicates one of the irreducible dangers to which the moviegoer is exposed: the danger of surrendering to the corroboration of one's fantasies as they are thrown back from the screen. It's impossible to ascertain the extent to which Jolson might have been an escaped personality for African-Americans, who thronged to *The Jazz Singer* and *The Singing Fool*. As one black newspaper critic remarked somewhat tongue-in-cheek vis-a-vis *The Jazz Singer*: with all the negroes trying to pass for white, it was nice to see a white man - that is Jolson - trying to be black for a

- change. That performers white and black use blackface suggest a kind of equivalency or interchangeability.
- 17:30 Charles Musser: When black newspapers asserted Jolson's debt to black entertainer Bert Williams, it was a way of reordering relations of authority and power. We don't have to be naive about racial politics, and polit, racial politics on screen or off, but we do need to respect the perception that Al Jolson and *The Jazz Singer* receive from black moviegoers, and try to make sense of him. On the other hand, we have to wonder why Michael Rogin was so distressed by *The Jazz Singer*. He seemed to think that blackface was fostering an assimilationist, melting-pot ideology, in which the Jewish Jolson - Jack Robin - is passing for white, which is to say WASP [white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant], and in a sense loses his identity as a good Jew. Now, given the fact that the film itself has quite a few scenes that take place in a Jewish synagogue and that Jack Robin - that is Jolson - sings the *Kol Nidre*, this concern for rejection of Jewish identity seems overwrought if not misplaced. Rather, what we see is in Rogin's reaction to the film is a strong fear of creolization of cultural and even biological mongrelization. He longs for a pure Jewish identity to somehow be ongoing. If Rogin focuses on the fact that Jack Robin dared to put on blackface and sing a mammy song, he may actually be more disturbed by the fact that he's dating a goy [non-Jewish person].
- 18:47 Charles Musser: If the reception *The Jazz Singer* in black newspapers and theaters forces a reevaluation of the film, I now want to turn to examining the film's genealogy and its process of adaptation. Examining such a process can certainly illuminate the work's meaning. But before I do this for *The Jazz Singer*, I want to briefly describe an earlier film adaptation, one of that is relevant for *The Jazz Singer* because it involves Ernst Lubitsch, who was instrumental in the making of said film in that the Warner Brothers brought the, bought the film rights to *The Jazz Singer* for him and planned to direct it. Ernst Lubitsch's *Lady Windermere's Fan* is a self-evidently, a radical film adaptation of Oscar Wilde's famed play which sophisticated audiences might see as a brilliant comic duel between Lubitsch's visual wit and wild verbal pyro - pyrotechnics. As many reviews of the film in the 1920s suggest, the film could be better appreciated if one knew the play. Interestingly, while Lubitsch claimed his film was a faithful adaptation, he did not use a single line of dialogue from the play. As critics noted, only a brilliant director such as Lubitsch would have been so audacious. The film both negates the play and is faithful at the same time. Fair enough, however after happening to see the original 1916 film adaptation of Wilde's *Lady Windermere's Fan* directed by Fred Paul for Ideal Films, I realized the actual process of adaptation had been much richer and more complex than people realized. Lubitsch's film was not only a radical adaptation of Wilde's play, it was a hidden remake of the Ideal Film which was distributed in the United States by Triangle Film Corp in 1919.

- 20:39 Charles Musser: Now, the potential wordplay in both instances was, I would argue, much appreciated by Lubitsch. Perhaps it was a kind of private joke because for pr, fed, for Fred Paul had already discarded Wilde's dialogue. In this respect, Lubitsch was much more faithful to the Ideal film than to the Wilde play. Moreover, within the play itself what is hidden is what's closest to one's heart: Mrs. Erlynne's secret that Lady Windermere is her daughter; Lord Windermere's check stubs to Mrs. Erlynne, which are locked in a drawer; not to mention of course Oscar Wilde's homosexuality, which is kept in the closet. The play's triangle, Mrs. Erlynne, Lord and Lady Windermere is echoed by the triangularization of adaptation in which Lubitsch and the film combine elements of an Ideal motion picture and a Wilde play. That is, in his use of dual, for dual sources Lubitsch expresses his double allegiance treating theater and film equally when theory and criticism did much to keep them apart - in which theater, if you would, would be high culture and movies would be low culture. This utopic synthesis of the two would also hold for his ideal audience of theatergoers, whose knowledge of stage and screen would be both equal and encyclopedic.
- 21:58 Charles Musser: While shooting pickups in New York for *Lady Windermere's Fan* with Irene Rich, Lubitsch saw Samuel [Samson] Raphaelson's play *The Jazz Singer* - this was shortly after it opened - and he saw it with the Warner brothers, who would eventually produce the film adaptation. Now, Neal Gabler, author of *An Empire of their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood*, laud, lauds the Jewish American Warner brothers for tackling a subject of Jewish-American culture based on the experience of the play's author Samson Raphaelson, who grew up on the Lower East Side, and the film's star Al Jolson. Unfortunately for some of this argument, the Warner brothers did not think much of the Raphaelson play. It was Lubitsch who urged them to buy it the following year, so he could turn it into a film. Charles Musser: Lubitsch was again looking forward to creating another triangle, another instance of artistic mongrelization. This involved a play and a feature film that E.A. Dupont made in Berlin in 1923, *Das Alte Gasetz*, *The Ancient Law*. Although a quite fascinating film, *The Ancient Law* was never shown widely in the United States. It wasn't reviewed by *Variety* and it was not reviewed in the mainstream press, nor um - in a way it was obscure, hidden like the British film version of *Lady Windermere's Fan*.
- 23:15 Charles Musser: Lubitsch, of course, never made *The Jazz Singer* but this idea of a cinematic remake was obviously not a secret, for it strongly reflected in the completed film. Fellow Warner Brothers director and New York-born Jew Alan Crosland a highly capable, if not brilliant director, understood what Lubitsch was doing in a general way. Perhaps Crosland even got tips from Lubitsch on the side, as he was making the film. Textual comparison strongly suggests that *The Ancient Law* was a reference point for him in making this film. Even though, we will obviously never see the brilliant masterpiece that Lubitsch would have likely made if he'd actually been able to direct. Here again, we see a work that drew on both stage

and screen for its antecedents, but what does it get us? For me, the discovery of this new inner text is important because it complements. I almost want to say it's dialectically related to the unexpected responses from African American audiences. Lubitsch was crossing lines between high and low, low culture in one area, while Jolson was crossing boundaries - that is the color line - in another.

24:22 Charles Musser: *The Jazz Singer* and *The Ancient Law* are two films about the theater and about the tension between timeless tradition - as evidenced by the weight of Orthodox Judaism, Judaism - and the energy of modernity - as expressed by the theater. However both Samson Raphaelson's play *The Jazz Singer*, which opened in September 1925 to mixed reviews. Before then, his play there was Raphaelson's short story *The Day of Atonement*, published in *Everybody's Magazine* in January 1922. The story contained the basic idea used in all three elements of the textual triangle, that the actor was, had gotten his big break - but his performance is to premiere on Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement. We can only surmise, with varying degrees of certainty, the extent to which earlier texts were sources for later ones. It is thus possible that Raphaelson's short story, *The Day of Atonement*, was one source for *The Ancient Law*. Perhaps, along with Mark Arnshteyn's Polish play *Singers*, from 1903, which he later translated into Yiddish and was a well-known play in which a 19th century Cantor leaves his town for Warsaw, where he becomes an opera singer. Forsaking his family and faith, it all comes tumbling down on the Day of Atonement. Certainly the dilemma is more credible when set in 1860s Vienna, as it is in *The Ancient Law*, than in 1920s New York, as it is with *The Jazz Singer*. It's hard to imagine any New York theater manager would be stupid enough to open a musical on such a night, in 19th-century Vienna it seems more credible.

25:58 Charles Musser: So E.A. Dupont could have borrowed the idea from Raphaelson and made it his own, this includes making the father a rabbi rather than a Cantor, and the son acting Shakespeare rather than singing ragtime or opera. If so, Dupont made other changes as well. Instead of having the father die at home, a broken man, Dupont has the rabbi change. He reads Shakespeare and watches his son perform, only then realizing the error of his ways and dying in peace, at his son's home. This ending is the reverse of the short story, where there is no reconciliation between father and son. It's also possible that Raphaelson saw *The Ancient Law* and this encounter inspired him to return to his earlier short story and turn it into a play. Certain scenes, such as Jack Robin in his dressing room torn between going on stage or going to sing *Kol Nidre*, are not mentioned in the short story, but evoke Dupont's film. Perhaps this is coincidence. Is it by chance? Uh, but other things, uh much, the much-increased tension between the father and son, the fact that the son has been declared dead by his father, are not in the short story but are shared with the Dupont film.

- 27:11 Charles Musser: As with the princess in *The Ancient Law*, the girlfriend - now Mary Dale - takes on an entirely new narrative role as she discovers and promotes the aspiring performer. Assuming that this extensive borrowing was the case - and why not borrow, since Dupont had seemingly borrowed from him - Raphaelson's debt to *The Ancient Law* remained hidden, unspoken. What seems certain is that Ernst Lubitsch saw Dupont's film. Dupont was in the, in the United States after the success of his movie *Variety* and went to Hollywood. By March 1926 he was scheduled to make a film version of *Romeo and Juliet*. Dupont had actually apprenticed to Lubitsch and, as secular Jews and Berlin-based directors, they must have stayed in touch. It was in mid-1926 that the Warner brothers bought the rights to Raphaelson's Broadway play and someone, initially Lubitsch, began to prepare a script that drew equally on both the Raphaelson play and the Dupont film. How, and what form, the script or idea got to Crosland is unclear. Likewise, at what stage and how Crosland saw *The Ancient Law* remains a mystery, though, like Baruch, Crosland began his career performing Shakespeare.
- 28:23 Charles Musser: This connection is only confirmed by comparing the two films. For instance, the emphasis on Jewish ritual in the synagogue is extensive and spectacular in both films and strikes one as quite unusual. Dupont's successful deployment and integration of this material into *The Ancient Law* must have provided a useful model for Crosland. Moreover, the two films shared many other moments, or building blocks, for their narratives. For starters, *The Ancient Law* served as a reference point for developing the Raphaelson's play's backstory. In two parallel moments, Baruch in *The Ancient Law* and Jakie in *The Jazz Singer* perform as youngsters, and each has his performance brought to an end by his father. In *The Ancient Law* Baruch is caught and punished by his father for becoming a Purim actor. [film clip shown] It's a kind of very spontaneous thing that he does and everyone's waiting to see what his father's reaction is going to be. [film clip shown] So he throws him, throws him out of the room. This gets translated to *The Jazz Singer*. [film clip shown] There's Jakie singing as a kid and here's his father.
- 30:22 Charles Musser: So later, after both men have been inducted into the theater world and are on the verge of their big break, both signal their commitment to this new world, against the dictates of established religious practices, by somewhat similar gestures. Baruch cuts his sidelocks [film clip shown] and in the process, he becomes a kind of matinee star. So the corresponding scene in *The Jazz Singer* is a little different. [film clip shown] as Jack Robin eats ham and eggs [Jakie Roniowitz -- the Cantor's son, a jazz singer. But fame was still an uncaptured bubble -- Al Jolson] Now, of course, I don't know if you've heard about the story about the Warner brothers uh but Jack Warner had a, a breakfast with his father one day and as a kind of sign of rebellion ordered ham and eggs. To his surprise, his father followed his order with his own order of ham and eggs, and, uh, so this is like, a

- kind of inside joke, it seems to me, that this going on here. But it absolutely corresponds, uh, to to what's going on in, in *The Ancient Law*.
- 32:16 Charles Musser: So a crucial scene in both films is the moment that each performer is discovered by a powerful female patron. Princess Elisabeth Theresia watches Baruch play Romeo, Baruch play Romeo in *Romeo and Juliet* and is totally smitten. So here you have a kind of, you know, he's this is a kind of third-rate theater company which he's apprenticed himself to and suddenly the company's asked to put on *Romeo and Juliet* and he's been sort of rehearsing it. So he, he's the only guy who possibly can play Romeo in the, in the, in the group. Uh, it's sort of his theater debut [film clip shown] and Princess Elisabeth Theresia, that's there in the middle, her reaction is not necessarily shared by other members of the royal party. But again, you know, the, one of the differences between these two films is the way that E.A. Dupont lets things play out in a much more leisurely fashion, explores what's going on with secondary characters, and around the scene, and lets it build slowly - as the princess becomes more and more enchanted, as others become more and more bored.
- 34:13 Charles Musser: So you know this is a kind of classic case of the slumming upper class going, going to see the, what goes on in the, among the hoi polloi. Right? Uh going down to Chinatown was what they liked. Going up to Harlem was what, was one of the things that the elites used to do in New York. This is, uh, the princess's counterpart but she's totally taken as you can see. [film clip shown] Feeding Baruch line, his lines. Obviously, he hasn't had a chance to memorize them. [film clip show] I love the way these close-ups are sort of interspersed through the film, through the scene, through begins and ends. And the same thing happens in *The Jazz Singer* as he's performing and Mary Dale comes for the first time and we get a nice close-up of her seeing him, becoming enchanted.
- 35:45 [film clip shown]
And when my work is done
Coming home from the setting sun
At the gate, he will start to run
And then I'll kiss my boy
- Dirty hands! dirty face!
Little devil, that's what they say
But to me, he's an angel of joy
- 36:16 Charles Musser: So yeah, so you know the, it's a much more concise scene. What goes on between him and Mary Dale is, uh, is basically what it's, it's all about, um, as she watches him in a San Francisco dive bar. Likewise, the scenes in which Jack and Baruch are in their dressing room backstage agonizing over the impossible choice between their religious heritage and their commitment to the law of the theater on Yom Kippur, between going to the synagogue and performing on

- opening night whatever the cost, have uncanny similarities; unless it's the self-evident case of one providing the model for the other. So here we have *The Ancient Law*. Baruch is playing Hamlet. He's about to go on; this is his big, big break, and if he, he knows that if he doesn't go on that his theater career is over. [film clip shown] But of course, this is the Day of Atonement, so he thinks back about his father. It's a kind of motivated cut so we, we, we go back to, uh, to this this moment of, uh, pain and in which, of course, his father's also obviously feeling his absence. [film clip shown]
- 37:48 Charles Musser: So, I mean, this is, you know, again, I think, one of the powerful aspects of this film is the extensive cutaway, flashback, parallel editing. It's, it's you, the relationship between what's going on here and what's going on with Baruch is, can be interpreted in a number of ways simultaneously, as a kind of some memory, uh, kind of parallel action, and then we return to Baruch [film clip shown] And obviously Dupont really gives an opportunity for this to play out. This is a kind of crucial scene in the film. It's a kind of tour de force for the actor. And Princess, uh, Elisabeth Theresia makes a crucial appearance at this point, but she stays in the audience. It will be interesting to see how Alan Crosland and in the adaptation of it from *The Jazz Singer* repositions her counterpart, Mary Dale. So he's left alone with his thoughts until the man comes in and sort of says, it's time to go on stage. So he takes the book with him and so he goes to perform *Hamlet*.
- 41:42 Charles Musser: In *The Jazz Singer* Mary Dale's in the, in the dressing room. I think allow, which enables him to express things in words that are conveyed only through facial expression and action, uh, in *The Ancient Law*. And also, we get to see Al Jolson actually put on blackface from beginning to end which, I think, not something you see too often - putting on. But if you can think of it as putting on the mask of theater. [film clip shown] And looking at the photo of his mother just stops him in his tracks. And of course, one of the things about *The Jazz Singer*, as you must have noticed, is a lot of this is happening much more in close up. And instead of a cutaway, we have this, uh, sort of vision sequence if you will, instead of cutting away to the father as in *The Ancient Law*.
- 44:31 Charles Musser: But it's obviously very much the same idea [film clip shown] and here, unlike some of the other earlier scenes, Crosland is willing to really play this out, uh, and for all it's worth and, in that respect, I think it also shares something with *The Ancient Law*. [film clip shown] Crosland's jazz singer draws equally and alternately on Raphaelson's play and Dupont's film. Moisha Yudelson, the kibitzer in *The Jazz Singer* looks very much like the wandering Jew, the snorer, in *The Ancient Law*. They have a similar relationship to the father and also, to the son - though one is the inside-out version of the other. Crosland does not always have Lubitsch's famed touch but there are moments when his ability to find a third way would have pleased Lubitsch - even if Lubitsch had already sketched them out. This would include the ending. In Dupont's *The Ancient Law*, the father has a change of heart

- after reading Shakespeare. He comes to the theater where he sees his son perform. The rabbi realizes that his former pronouncements, declaring himself, declaring that his son was dead were wrong. He staggers back to his son's elegant home and dies, asking for his forgiveness.
- 46:34 Charles Musser: In Raphaelson's play, the father dies without offering forgiveness, brokenhearted that his son has become an actor. With his death, the son gives up acting and sings Kol Nidre at the synagogue. The mother survives but it's not at all clear that her attitudes towards the stage are much different than her husband's. She also does not go to see as her son perform. In the film version of *The Jazz Singer*, we see a third way. Jack Robin does not perform, but the opening is merely postponed while he goes to sing Kol Nidre. The father forgives and the mother, rather than the father, subsequently goes to the theater and sees her son perform. Instead of watching his son perform [Friedrich] Schiller, Schiller's *Don Carlos*, about the relationship between father and son in which the father kills the son - this in *The Ancient Law* - he sings *Mammy*, about his loving relationship to his mother. None of these are strictly speaking, I think, happy endings, though critics have sometimes wanted to make them seem that way as if the Warner film version was having it both ways. I do not think this is, strictly speaking, a fair assessment.
- 47:43 Charles Musser: What is more striking, to me at least at this point, is that the film version of *The Jazz Singer* ends differently than the other two works on which it depends, signaling its independence and originality. *The Jazz Singer* tells us something about the theater world and perhaps America in which, for instance, the son of a poor Cantor can meet and marry the daughter of a wealthy WASP lawyer. The theater was also a place where African-Americans and whites could appear on the same stage together, and where black performers - like actresses - were theoretically paid what they were worth at the box office, though there were certainly complaints and doubts about this. As *The Jazz Singer* and *The Ancient Law* remind us, the theater often serves as a kind of utopic space, not walled off in the outside world but, nonetheless, a place where many things could happen that rarely happened any place else. This intertextual assessment suggests that Crosland's *The Jazz Singer* was not first and foremost about the black, white racial divide, and certainly not about Jews trying to pass for white at the expense of African-Americans.
- 48:47 Charles Musser: Rather, it offered audiences a utopic vision of crossing racial, religious, ethnic, and media-specific boundaries, and showed the way that a newly reconfigured theater could provide a liberating force over and against tradition. Timeless religious practices give way and must accommodate to secularism, modernity, and cosmopolitan culture, and a form of multicultural interaction that is transgressive in a positive sense. At the same time, the rigid commandments of the theater must also be softened. Premieres should not happen on Yom Kippur. Sons should be allowed to suspend their performance and honor their parents in death,

- even as children who become actors should not be deemed dead by rigid sanctimonious fathers. This utopic aspiration, which has often been dismissed as sentimentality, was one reason why Americans, Jews, Catholics, WASPs, and the African-American, and African-Americans flocked to *The Jazz Singer* in the late 1920s, for it spoke to their circumstances and their aspirations, not against them.
- 49:51 Charles Musser: So what did *The Ancient Law* and *The Jazz Singer* tell us about racism and antisemitism in German and American cinema? In many respects, not much. At least, they need to be contextualized. Cynthia Walk does this in her fascinating article, *Romeo with Sidelocks*. *The Ancient Law* is she tells us, an extraordinary exception in German cinema of the period in that it imagines a world in which Jews become integrated into German society without losing their identity. Baruch ends up marrying his childhood sweetheart from the shtetl. *The Jazz Singer*, in contrast, is quite typical of American movies of this period. The amazingly successful play *Abie's Irish Rose*, from 1922, in which a nice Jewish boy and a Catholic girl marry and reconcile with their disapproving parents after the birth of their child, inspired numerous motion pictures of a similar nature and eventually reached the screen in 1928. Integration, symbolically symbolized by intermarriage, is a persistent theme in American silent cinema of the 1920s. The couple meet resistance, but it's overcome. Thank you.
- 51:07 Frank Mecklenburg: So, thank you. After this wonderful talk and presentation and, I think, um, first, um, we'll give everybody five minutes to bring in their own comments, and, um, how you, what is your perspective on, on this film and presentation? And Deborah, maybe you want to start?
- 51:32 Deborah Hertz: Well, I think the question before us is the question of the meaning of blackface, and what does it mean to historicize blackface? Let us presume that Professor Musser's rendition of the African-Americans of the late 1920s reacting positively to the film. He's brought us evidence. He, you can't, you can't tear up the newspaper articles. And yet, uh, obviously in our own climate today blackface is viewed as horrendously racist. So if those things are both true, it seems to me the question is how do we move between those? When is it that blackface becomes horrendous and what is the significance of discovering that it was not seen as horrendous by the supposed victims of the time, who were sympathetic with everything that Al Jolson was doing? For me, that's a very, very difficult problem. How can I defend some, how can I defend something and not excuse it in the present? So it's a question of this shifting, the shifting meanings of race. I'm going to leave aside here all the conversations about um, Jewish-Christian integration. Uh, just leave those aside for a minute, but I just pose to the other panelists what, and to Professor Musser also, what do we do with this gap between 1929, and the, 1927 and the present? How do we bridge it?
- 53:03 Allan Havis: Um, I'd like to approach the topic by bringing up Flip Wilson and Tyler Perry. So in the trope and the transgression of going to minstrel and blackface, Flip

Wilson in the early [19]70s created in his tv show, uh, *Geraldine*. He was in drag and there was no flack whatsoever in that transgression. Milton Berle did that, you know, in the [19]50s. So that was acceptable. However, Tyler Perry, with the character Medea in his films, he is catching some flack from some people in the black community, as well as, in the progressive community that this is pandering. So it's not the quite the same formula of the taboo of Al Jolson in our time period, but essentially there's something about the sacredness of identity, and when we become, in a secular community, so overwrought that that there is an offense that's almost, um, like the 11th commandment you, you're not allowed to appropriate my culture or my gender. So um, we're in a very difficult time period on the, even in politics, about what you can say and what are you appealing or pandering to identity alignment and what, you can't make a joke if you are not of that culture. So I'm just going to hold for that, that thought.

54:44 Frank Mecklenburg: Cynthia, did you want to?

54:50 Cynthia Walk: I'm fascinated by the, um, a different, uh, subject that was touched on, that was explored in Charles Musser's lecture, the what he called the triangularization of sources in creating *The Jazz Singer*. I'll come back to that but I want to collect my thoughts.

55:25 Frank Mecklenburg: Okay. Charles, you want to respond to them?

55:34 Charles Musser: Um, you know, like, like many things, uh, blackface is in some sense a construction, right? And I at least think I touched on actually three different ways in which it was being used. One by people like Griffith, uh, which I, I think one looks at and can understand was offensive to the black community at the time. Although it's, it's really at the same time fascinating to the extent to which Griffith remained. People, the black press, was amazingly sympathetic to Griffith given that he made *Birth of a Nation*. I mean, it was really very forgiving, but nonetheless, uh, you know that use of blackface, the, the use of blackface by, within the black community itself and then, and then, people like Jolson who, who we're aligned with. So, but I, I think what happens is in in the [19]30s, it becomes, sort of, increasingly outmoded and certainly after World War II, uh, with the rise of the Civil Rights Movement, uh, I think blackface becomes more and more unacceptable. Um and, and you know, it's it's been decades where people get into trouble by, uh, you know, feeling that they can play with this, And uh, you know, we're at that point now. Uh but of course, as I alluded to, you know, the, uh, it's, the persistence of this - right - it turns out in Canada, as well with uh, uh, with [Justin] Trudeau, uh, is really quite amazing, but it's sort of under, undercover. It's, it's sort of hidden but then it pops up in yearbooks and, uh, stuff like that. So, um you know, so, so, so, I, I think there's a shift.

57:07 Charles Musser: You can look for other parallels to this, for instance like Uncle Tom. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* into the 1920s remains a great play and movie, very

appreciatively reviewed and talked about in the black press. You know, the term Uncle Tom, I mean, Uncle Tom as a figure in the 1920s is still a sympathetic figure in the black press. You know, by the 1930s and certainly after World War II, that's gone. Right? So, so there's a, there's this, this shift is part of a larger shift in terms of the relationship between a certain kind of cultural heritage and, and, and, and the black community. Uh, you know, um, I was just uh, looking at *Black is...Black Ain't* by Marlon Riggs, you know, and he talks about the moment when he told his friend - who was bigger than him - you know, you're not colored. You're black, And he said, that is like those were fighting words when I said that, you know, and he was going to beat me up until I said, well my mother's black too. And then he said, well if you're going to say your mother's black then? So, so there's a, there, there is a way in which the construction of, and, and, and what is, is acceptable. So I, I, but I, I think you could link it particularly. It might be helpful to link it with Uncle Tom, uh, and the way in which his character shifted from being sympathetic to being a kind of - those would be fighting words now if you called some, a black person an Uncle Tom.

58:41 Frank Mecklenburg: So when, when we look at this, and with your comments, um, um we also, of course, have to look at sort of the historical, the historic periods here. And, and all of these happen in the 1920s, late 19-, in the first, in the first half of the 20th century, in the first third of the 20th century. And that is a time when these issues actually become, sort of, a matter of public debate. I mean, this is, of course, after the Civil War and, uh, the end of slavery and, and, and these sort of issues. But we, we have now moved much further along and, sort of, out of that moment, out of that time that, uh, you, you were uh showing us here. A much broader debate has emerged and has become, sort of, a debate about a global affair, decolonization. I mean, all topics that at the time were not on the same level as, as we have them, uh, today. And so, it may seem as if there is sort of a flip of issues, that certainly, suddenly, things are being uh, sort of, yeah, sort of, um, standardized or taboo-ized. And uh, and um, so often the, um, the response to this is, in those days things were much more tolerant. And in a, in a certain way, um, this may have, uh, sort, of seemed in, in, uh, when when you were saying in the very early moving pictures, um, all sorts of people were sort of in front of the camera. But isn't that also, maybe, um, you know, sort of a short-sightedness on our part, um in, in the sense that um, we, we have moved on, and, and sort of, we are on on a very different platform now then, then this was, um yeah, basically 100 years ago.

101:07 Charles Musser: Well you know, I, I think one thing is to keep in mind that uh, that, that the, the representations of race, uh, were much more complicated in the teens and the [19]20s than people sometimes think, right? That Griffith and *Birth of a Nation* is really sort of considered emblematic of how Americans thought about race, and it was the most successful motion picture of the silent period, and not to be dismissed. It, but at the same time you know, there were the, the counterpart

would be *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and other, other films. So there was a range, uh, and, and, and really a struggle around representation of race in, in the teens in the [19]20s and I think Al Jolson participated in that. On the other hand, I'd like to say too though that this idea, that would certainly apply to Al Jolson, of love and theft is something that continues today with rap singers, right? It's just they don't they just don't wear blackface, but they they sing like they're black. You know, they, they appropriate black culture. Uh and, and so, you know, this is, this, this is a, this is an issue as well. I mean, uh you know, is it appropriate? Uh, what happens when, uh, you know, when this happens?

- 1:02:19 Deborah Hertz: Yeah, I mean, I think the whole contrast between the term appropriation and the term homage is so, it's so tricky. Because in the readings that I did on *The Jazz Singer* when my class uh, uh viewed it last year, um, there was a, I don't know - I don't think it's in Rogin but it's, it's in your article - but the notion that when he puts on, when [Al] Jolson puts on the blackface he becomes more in touch with his being a son, and he sings the song to his mammy. And I think there is a notion there that by, by wearing the blackface he's becoming a different actor. In fact, I think there are quotes from him where he says, I do my best acting when I'm wearing blackface. Now that, to me, the way he puts it, is an homage to black - I'm not sure what the word is - black acting, black feeling, the notion that blacks are particularly emotional, and that, you know, whites have to escape this. So you could ask an interesting question, you know. Jewishness is not enough, right? So he's put in this position where he has essentially, you could say, three choices. He could go back for Yom Kippur and be the good son, right? He can be a white man, in a white world but he's got, he's doing something that's a third thing. He's a Jewish man in a white world - let's say for purposes of argument - giving an homage to blackness. So there's really three ethnicities that are in the mix. And why is he drawn to this? Because it was not just in *The Jazz Singer*. It was not just that uh, that uh Crosland writes the scene. Apparently, he performed quite often in blackface. And I mean, maybe you know, if you do a reconstruction of all his different performances both in film and in person, you know, what is the mix of the audience? Is he ever performing in blackface for a largely black audience? Is it for a largely Jewish audience? Or is it for a, you know, as it were a white, a white Christian audience?
- 1:04:31 Allan Havis: It opens up another problem of fetishizing the other. And, it's hard to go back in time to that time that that period of American history. I wish we had an African-American on this panel to go to this very, very delicate issue because I think we are a little bit tone-deaf.
- 1:04:50 Deborah Hertz: But you're just instantiating what you criticized when you first talked, that only the people from the group have the right to speak and that they have a hallowed opinion.
- 1:04:59 Allan Havis: No, not, it's not giving the right to speak. It's to capture the greater dimension of the problem, not the authorization of the of the opinion. I, I think we

- have a blind spot, that's all. Uh and I also wanted to bring up Stepin Fetchit [Lincoln Theodore Monroe Andrew Perry] and Amos and Andy. Amos and Andy the radio show, and then it crossed over as a TV show, and it was very popular - perhaps more for white audiences than for black audiences. Uh, it still was not considered as offensive back in 1958 as it might be today when people look at those, those videos or those audio tapes. So, there's a, it's pandering to what is the cultural appetite. And I also want to bring up one other thought. It's not about cinema, but in the 1960s in the Civil Rights Movement African-Americans and Jews had a great coalition. And the death of three civil rights workers, activists, in Mississippi, the murder by the KKK, we lost that coalition. I'm Jewish. We lost that vital coalition by the end of the 1960s, with the rise of the Black Panthers and other issues that created a divide with that alliance, and it hasn't been repaired since then.
- 1:06:18 Charles Musser: And it was very much in effect in the 1920s. I mean, a lot of the financial support for the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] came from, uh, Jewish funders. Um I, I just want to reiterate that, that the mask, uh the, the blackface, the way I think it's appearing in *The Jazz Singer* is the mask of theater, as much. Where he's putting that, by putting on the mask of theater it, it's also liberating. Uh, you know that, that, you know that, when you can, you know, I think the notion of a mask is sort of lost to us increasingly with cinema, uh, where there's a certain kind of realism, right? That we assume that acting, uh, but I think still, in the, in the [19]20, in the [19]20s it could be read more readily in, as, as a mask of theater, than it would be today.
- 1:07:10 Frank Mecklenburg: Well, I want to bring up another topic. And you've briefly alluded to that, and which is the question of audience and, I think, the relationship between audience and the stage. And that, I mean this, this stage and the audience has always existed in the theater, but film suddenly is a different, uh, is a different medium. And um, and when we look at how that relationship functions today, where the audience is sort of appealed to for a much more interactive, I mean, it's not such a strict division any longer um, and especially when we talk about social media and rap music, and things like that. The, the relationship has changed. It is much more fluid and, and so in, in what sense are these these, um these films also important on creating sort of a certain image that has not been appropriated by the audience, but the audience is sort of confronted with these things. And maybe sort of, is that also a question of the astonishment that the audience has over what they are suddenly seeing there in moving pictures that has sort of gotten lost, and we have a different relationship to what is presented to us
- 1:08:53 Deborah Hertz: Yeah, I wanted to ask Cynthia a question, and that has to do with the scene in *Das alte Gesetz* when Baruch is about to play Hamlet, which is of course about self-doubt and fatherhood, you can see the Shakespeare and in the, in the, uh in the movie, in *Das alte Gesetz* [unclear] and praise himself. How do you interpret that scene?

- 1:09:17 Cynthia Walk: Uh I think at that moment, uh, Baruch is not simply lost in the thoughts, as you suggest, he is actually, uh, using that moment before he goes on stage to perform the rituals of Yom Kippur and, as someone said, he Davens. He takes his prayer book out; he reads the prayers, and he Davens. And then when he stands up, he takes the prayer book, and he puts it over his heart, under his costume. In other words, yes. In as an actor, he must perform on Yom Kippur but and that, that's his public obligation. But he does so, um, as a believing Jew and with, the testimony is is the Siddur under his costume
- 1:10:17 Deborah Hertz: So do you see a parallel moment in *The Jazz Singer* or do you see a parallel?
- 1:10:22 Cynthia Walk: No. I, I think, uh, they're quite different, the two films, in the, in, in the dressing room. Um, uh, the um, the conversation with Mary, uh, does not give him room, if you will, to move into, uh, the, this exercise of, of of religious devotion. Um, he speaks about, um, his family, his father, his, his, his uh, his uh, uh -
- 1:11:01 Charles Musser: Well but in the next scene he, I mean, he doesn't go on. See that's, you know, he doesn't go on and in fact, he goes to the synagogue and he does sing, right? So, so actually, in that sense, you point out the ways in which I would say, they're they're, more parallel, you know. Uh, I mean because, because they both, they, they've -
- 1:11:18 Cynthia Walk: So he's preparing for that?
- 1:11:20 Charles Musser: It's, it's like the whole scene is not played out, right? We we stop. We don't see him leave. We don't see him. We don't actually see the decision which is that he's not going to go on, right? So, so it's different, and yet it's, it seems to me, it's, it's working through in a slightly different way. But what's going on in [unclear], well I mean, I like your interpretation. It's much more nuanced than, uh, than what I've been thinking.
- 1:11:46 Cynthia Walk: But it's leading. Your point is, it's leading to the same place.
- 1:11:49 Charles Musser: Right, um, and you know seeing his father in the mirror, which is, which happens actually fairly late in that scene, is very much like when Baruch is really thinking about his father and we cut back to his, to his father.
- 1:12:02 Cynthia Walk: And, but that is parallel montage. That, that, that is not his vision. As I interpreted, that is simultaneous action, because that's really happening in the shtetl, at the same time. This is Yom Kippur and in this shtetl the father, the father is, is uh, calling.
- 1:12:19 Charles Musser: But the powerful thing about cinema is it can be both, right? It's not, I mean that's not real, right? In that sense, you can't literally. That's not what he, but it's like, as if that's what he's, he's imagining. He's, it's like there's time travel, or

there's, you know, he's able to. It's, you know, it, it's totally ambiguous for the audience. The audience can do with it what it wants, what it wants, right?

- 1:12:41 Cynthia Walk: It is simultaneous and at the same time he's intuiting it.
- 1:12:46 Charles Musser: Right.
- 1:12:47 Deborah Hertz: Okay, well I'm now going to introduce the conclusion of our talk, which is Dr. Erik Mitchell, our wonderful Director of the Library.
- 1:12:55 Dr. Erik Mitchell: And uh, can everybody please join me in giving our great panel a round of applause? Thank you so much. So, a big thanks to Charles and to Cynthia and everybody who's joined us tonight. Um, on behalf of the Library and our Jewish Studies Program, I just want to thank you all for attending this evening's Holocaust Living History Workshop. As you all appreciate, and Deborah said earlier, we really rely on you to sustain this incredible program and we really appreciate your support. Tonight's event was sponsored by the Leo Beck Institute and the Sunrise Foundation for Education and the Arts. Thank you very much. Support was also provided by the African-American Studies minor program and the Film Studies minor program here at UC San Diego. So please join me again in a round of applause in thanking our sponsors. And as you've heard, I hope, this event is part of the Year of German Fellowship, so thank you. Thank you panel. Thank you audience and have a wonderful evening.
- 1:14:02 [Racism in German and American Cinema of the Twenties: From *The Ancient Law* to *The Jazz Singer* / October 24, 2019]
- 1:14:07 [Featuring / Charles Musser, Professor of Film & Media Studies, Yale University / Frank Mecklenburg, Professor of Film & Media Studies, Yale University / Deborah Hertz, Professor of History and Herman Wouk Chair in Modern Jewish Studies, UC San Diego]
- 1:14:13 [Featuring / Allan Havis, Chair, Department of Theatre & Dance, UC San Diego / Cynthia Walk, Associate Professor Emerita of German Literature & Film Studies, UC San Diego]
- 1:14:19 [Presented by / The Holocaust Living History Workshop / Deborah Hertz, Director, The Jewish Studies Program, UC San Diego / Susanne Hillman, Program Coordinator, The Holocaust Living History Workshop]
- 1:14:24 [UC San Diego Library / Erik Mitchell, The Audrey Geisel University Librarian / Nikki Kolupailo, Director of Communications and Engagement]
- 1:14:29 [UCTV / Producer, Lynn Burnstan / Camera Operators, John Menier, John Young / Editor, John Menier / Post-Production Supervisor, Mike Weber]

1:14:34 [The views, contents, and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the University of California]

1:14:4 [Read Write Think Dream / The Library / UC San Diego / Channel / www.uctv.tv/library-channel]

1:14:48 [uctv / University of California Television / www.uctv.tv / ©2019 Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved.]