Portrayals of Race and Ethnicity on Film: Viewing the Other

By Kelly Williams

October 19, 2012

Portrayals of race and ethnicity on film can give us a medium from which to view the accepted ideologies of the culture that produces them. They are useful as historical documents that, with the gift of hindsight, can gage how those ideologies are born, how they grow and change, and how some may even die. From the beginnings of cinema, pictures were wrought with ideological perspectives. For example, Jacob A. Riis's *How the Other Half Lives*, is a "tour through the urban jungle" in which "imperial expansion was discovering not only exotic non-Europeans but urban immigrants," (Rogin, 1050). The choice of language, *jungle* and *exotic*, suggest an attitude of viewing people under such a label as other and primitive. This view is a direct reflection of the sentiments held by the stockholders of the culture (stockholders being the dominant group of people in a nation). There are many factors that have influence on such ideology. For instance, in the early twentieth century, "mass immigration" created "multiethnic New York slums [that] brought savagery to the heart of civilization," (Rogin, 1051). This is to say that the established culture, decidedly Anglo-Saxon White in New York City, watched the mass immigration of people outside the dominant culture, threatening to overrun it. There was much resentment to be had as land and jobs were snatched up, along with resources that the white dominant group felt entitled to, as described by Harry M. Benshoff and Sean Grifin in <u>America on Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality at the Movies</u> (Benshoff, 47). After all, they had been using science to support their view of dominance for years (Benshoff, 48). With this science they convinced the other races of their inferiority, and kept them from opportunity, preserving it for themselves. "Facing nativist pressure that would assign them to the dark side of the racial divide, immigrants Americanized themselves by crossing and recrossing the racial line," (Rogin, 1053). They were not yet considered *white*, though the color of their skin may have fit that description. What Rogin means by crossing and recrossing is that they portrayed themselves in a manner that would garner more opportunity and hold capitol with the main group, but they still had connections with their culture of origin and often returned to it. Immigrants and minorities learned that to fit in, their progress had to be

toward *Americanization*, (Rogin, 1051). Americanization meant blending into the ideology and becoming one with the white Anglo-Saxon culture of America (Benshoff 55).

Though America is made up of immigrants, having previously been populated by indigenous non-whites, the Anglo-Saxon came to dominate the country. It is their outlook that pervaded history and art, casting all other groups in vague and unfair stereotypes that usually marginalized them in society (Benshoff, 51-54). The strength of a stereotype is dependent on its meaning being commonly shared. "Stereotypes alter form or style in order to maintain their *cognitive consistency* with observed social data or risk losing their aesthetic or social credibility. Some stereotypes erode as the social conditions that inspired them disappear," (Miller, 15). Thomas Cripps means to say that stereotypes are fluid, changing with the tide of understanding inside the dominant groups psyche. Though they do damage, with time, they can change entirely, disappearing from the ideology altogether due to social pressures based on new data. The reason they exist is that "stereotypes affirm the values of the dominant group," (Miller, 18). They form, particularly for use in film, "from a popular culture that depends upon imaginative use of familiar formulas for its audience appeal," (Miller, 15). Art and media require an understandable language in order to communicate and the use of stereotypes made this easier. It was obvious to the audience whom the types were meant to symbolize. They also "tend to assert a conservative point of view" and come from "literary conventions lacking in conscious political intent and surviving only so long as they serve the popular artist's purpose," (Miller, 16, 17). Political intent is arguable. However, purpose is clearly the basis of their use. For, "between these fading stereotypes and strategically invoked types is the broad center, the general case, the stereotypes designed to provide easily recognizable minor characters that casually set off main characters," (Miller, 17). It is a means to communicate with the audience, which is generally seen as the dominant group, and therefore, offense is not even considered in regards to other groups. For example, "Hollywood orientalism could bring once-forbidden pleasures to the mass movie audience as long as actual Asian Americans were kept out,"

(Rogin, 1058). Anglo-Saxon audiences might be offended or vexed by the site of actual representatives of these other races as being on par with their own (Benshoff, 54-55). After all, their sentiment was to see them as apart and lesser. Another example can be found in "Hollywood movies of the 1920s and 1930s [that] typically portrayed Latins as *lazy peasants and wily seňoritas*," (Rogin, 1059). Quite possibly, each race outside of *white* was seen exactly the same. It was a means by which they could assert dominance and affirm that dominance (Benshoff, 49). As I continue, I will focus on four groups who underwent and are still undergoing assimilation in American Society: the African-American, the Irish, Jews and Germans.

As, mentioned before, "the discovery and appropriation of native peoples, peoples defined by and ripped from their relationship to their land, stands at the origins of the United States," (Rogin, 1051). This was the point at which the Anglo-Saxon immigrants took over 'America' and built their own society on an already populated land. "Their society built on the land of Indians and with the labor of slaves, early Americans created a national culture on that material foundation. The two originary forms of that culture were the captivity narrative and blackface minstrelsy," (Rogin, 1052). In entertaining themselves with theater or by reading books, "Indian literature and blackface, moreover, expressed both racial aversion and racial desire. Both promoted identification with native peoples as a step in differentiation from them," (Rogin, 1052). Whites had come into contact with these *new* races and had to figure out their relationship to them. Captivity narratives and blackface helped to define that role, while avoiding the history that may inhibit any desire to identify with the chosen role. "Racial masquerade pointed to white privilege...sources of white advantage in the slaughter of Indians, the enslavement of African Americans, and the exploitation and exclusion of Asians were too terrible to acknowledge directly, racial masquerade also released the tension," (Rogin, 1053). In order to hold the ideology that they were above or dominant over such groups, they had to justify such treatment of them (enslavement and subjugation). In so doing, they relegated them to the status of object to more

easily handle the reality of actions against the marginalized group. Initial contact with indigenous peoples helped to facilitate that. Michael Rogin explains this objectification: "Discovery makes the discovered into passive objects, the discoverers into autonomous subjects…the discovered are objects not only of concrete utility but also of symbolic fascination," (Rogin, 1052). It also helps to alleviate any guilt and reassert their right to dominate. As Pocahontas says in Disney's 1995 adaptation in response to John Smiths labeling of her kind as savage: "What you mean is not like you."

Thomas Cripps explores this definition of other for the African American in his article "The Dark Spot in the Kaleidoscope: Black Images in American Film." Cripps notes that "between 1896 and 1909, black images on the screen compared favorably with and perhaps exceeded the range of their roles in real life," (Miller, 19). The lack of realistic portrayals points to a phenomenon called *white privilege*, and how whites had little to no knowledge of black culture. White privilege is that state of simply existing in and having a mindset that only allows you the perspective of the dominant white Anglo-Saxon culture. It sounds negative because of the associations we have come to be comfortable associating with it (another stereotype). Though it can be, a better example would be in how it was obvious that "Hollywood knew little of black culture…[and] diverted attention from urban black themes in favor of well-worn regional comedy and sentimentality," (Miller, 22). It's more a lack of understanding of other cultures, ethnicities and races and also a need to deny the hardships they had imposed upon the Africans in the United States. Such lack of understanding is what leads to stereotyping and hence a lessening of opportunity for the stereotyped group.

A number of factors can give rise to stereotyping. Cripps explains that in the "absence of a variety of black screen images their sameness constituted a stereotype," (Miller, 22). Also, "exclusion reinforced expropriation," a means to take away from the subjugated groups those values that may include them as part of the dominant group and weaken the dominant group's claim to dominance by erasing difference (Rogin, 1065). He goes on to cite that "Antebellum blackface minstrelsy grounded

American popular culture in expropriated black production," (Rogin, 1063). They were not representing themselves, but being represented by those who dominated them and hence defined who and what they were. In this way, *passing* individuals or groups (passing meaning those who could appear to be white) could claim to be part of the dominant group by highlighting their similarity and assert their whiteness. As Cripps states: "racial masquerade moves white ethnics from racially luminal to white identity," (Rogin, 1061). This form of masquerade also defined stereotypes held in place about African-Americans by those who sought to control them: "in minstrel ideology, blackface wildness invoked Africa, and blackface nostalgia invoked the lost plantation," (Rogin, 1068).

Stereotypes, being fluid things, did change with time. D.W. Griffith's *Birth of a Nation* stands out as the beginning of film narrative. The portrayals in the film are widely viewed as deeply racist with clear political intent. The films that came after Griffith's epic evolved with the slow change understanding surrounding race and ethnicity. With the social change brought on by the Great Depression, "blacks began to find a better place," in society and in film (Miller, 24). The use of blackface faded as black actors took up the roles that were previously barred to them and made the use of such tropes unnecessary in the presence of new conventions. This change introduced American society to a number of African Americans images which put names and faces to ideas, humanizing what had been easily dismissed as just an object. It is true that the images were not always positive representations, as stereotypes were still being reinforced, even among members of the typed community. For example, the actor Stepin Fetchit had such a double role. In seeing such representations, "many blacks were of two minds…the work of Stepin Fetchit and his imitators reveals the dilemma that divided them…Fetchit believed that his comic depiction of black manhood offered white audiences a disarming, unthreatening scamp who would improve deteriorating race relations. Unfortunately, Fetchit's employers encouraged repetition rather than breaking new ground, and his oft-repeated roles helped bar the screen to serious black roles," (Miller, 22). They were being included in telling the stories of American culture but only

under the terms of the dominant white culture. Another change came with the advent of the Second World War and the need for able bodied men to fight. "World War II became a watershed that marked the shattering of the former monopoly of movies held by the creators of southern genre Negroes...America's enemies cast their propaganda in racist terms...inviting Americans to assume the role of anti-colonial, anti-racist knight errant," (Miller, 25). Americans could not allow, for the sake of the war effort, their good name to be slandered. Though they had slandered in decades before, they now had to turn their efforts toward unifying all Americans on the home front. This need was quickly filled when "the government began to use films for wartime racial unity and harmony," (Miller, 26). They had drafted men from every walk of life to fill their ranks and now had to manage them and get them on board with the war effort. An army divided would fail. Back home, filmmakers "introduced stereotyping as a weapon of liberals...[who] fought racism by burlesquing it," (Miller, 27). This approach to racism revealed another reason behind its existence: miscegenation – the mixing of races through sexual relationships. Examining these films, sociologists have come to find that "white sexual anxieties" appeared to be "at the bottom of racism," (Miller, 28). That fear was so great, and viewed as such a threat that it was not openly approached for decades more. After the war, "Leftist filmmakers...helped reshape the tastes and racial politics of the postwar generation of school children, labor union members and churchgoers...Postwar conscience-liberalism became a dominant mode of responding to residual racism," (Miller, 27). LIberalism led the way to another shift in the roles of African-Americans in the cinema. I say led the way, because again, it was not perfect and ideology was still deeply entrenched.

Guess Who's Coming to Dinner is probably one of the most widely thought of films when thinking of African-American roles on film and with it, its star Sidney Poitier. The film came to the screen over two decades after the close of World War II and is an example of how long stereotypes and the roles they reinforce can perpetuate themselves. Against the established view of African-Americans, Poitier came to postwar film with "polished performances...he intruded into white life without

threatening it…grace and courage under pressure, guardedly cool manner and stereotypically *white* rationalism under his dark skin, all of it covering a hint of subsurface rage," (Miller, 29). Poitier was a combination of past and future. He allowed a black image into the psyche of white culture in such a manner that allowed the emotions of the Civil Rights movement (1955-1968) to be discussed without a threat to the dominant culture. The "subsurface rage" Cripps mentions had been a feature left out of many previous black portrayals out of fear of undoing any progress, but by this time it could no longer be ignored. Yet, Poitier's portrayal mixed this rage, making it both the rage of all mankind and the rage of black oppression (Benshoff, 87).

"Up to this point, whites controlled the movie industry," but in the 1970s a door was opened to black filmmakers (Miller, 30). This helped to change the voice of film, by changing the perspective of the lens, which had been white up until this time. Such films "hit during a black economic boom that saw a wave of disposable income and a black exodus to the suburbs," (Miller, 31). This group provided a new market for the industry to tap and it made sense to comply with the ideology they wanted communicated through their cinematic images. In this market, Black filmmakers "brought together politics, flair and color in a rash of movies…after a few years…filmmakers lost touch with all but the inner city remnants of their audience," (Miller, 31). These films became a genre termed *blaxploitation* films (Miller, 30-32). African American filmmakers "intended to give ghetto audiences a cheap alternative to Hollywood…[they] engaged in uncoordinated, sporadic assaults on stereotyping that had little effect until World War II helped release liberal social forces that shared many of the blacks' goals and ambitions," (Miller, 19).

In the current era of film, Black filmmakers are coming into the mainstream and breaking down barriers that once kept their films on the fringe, thought of as solely for black audiences with solely black themes (Benshoff, 51). Tyler Perry, Spike Lee and Anthony Hemingway are just a few directors enjoying the current climate in which stereotypes are yet again changing and being met with more questioning

than acceptance. Some may argue that their representations uphold stereotypes, much like their progenitor Stepin Fetchit, but films like Hemingway's *Red Tails* (2012) and Lee's *Miracle at St. Anna* (2008) give a wider range of roles and personalities than Fetchit's repeated single personality, not to mention that the lens is being guided not by White privilege but by Black privilege, giving a new vantage with which to view the Black experience. For instance, in *Red Tails* the viewer sees the struggles of a squadron of all black pilots as they seek to defend freedom and democracy while representing themselves and the United States in World War II. Their heroic service is questioned and defended on the screen, not only with words but with historical example that can be backed up with the reality of the actual Tuskegee Airmen. The film confronts the stereotypes they faced and still face. They approach miscegenation through the romance of Sofia and "Lightening." It is striking that when Lightening goes to Sofia's home, there is no fearful rejection of him as a dire threat to Sofia. The mother welcomes him in, is delighted to have him there as her guest. He introduces himself as American and they are most impressed. This is striking in light of the cinema that came before it. Not since, Shakespeare's *Othello* has such a relationship been looked at as just another relationship, just normal, or just a man and a woman. There was always a specter of race differences as unbridgeable or highly problematic. This is not to say that there is no mention of the difference, as "Easy" (Lightening's commander) brings it up in passing, but it is simply not mentioned again between these two. Even more striking is how easily Hemingway opens a dialogue to finally discuss these formerly dangerous images and shows how normal and unremarkable they are.

The difficulties imposed on the black airmen are all the responsibility of the white officers who command them. At the opening of the film, a 1925 Army War College Study is quoted as stating that Blacks were deemed inferior and unfit for service, as they were cowards and weak. In the opening scenes, all white bomber squads are shown with all white fighter escorts. These escorts abandon the bombers, in order to shoot down enemy planes and reap the glory of such efforts. The whites are shown

as willing to sacrifice their own for this glory, including the sacrifice of the war effort. The black squads are shown doing the small jobs, shooting up trains and caravans of trucks. They have grown confident and want greater responsibility, to contribute in greater ways to the war effort. The officers who plan the missions must be persuaded to let them. When they do, it is with the underlying hope that the Tuskegee Airmen will fail and prove them right. This is a difficult position to be in. Those who support the Red Tails want them to be given greater responsibility and prove their worth, seemingly confident they will and obviously terrified that some mishap will come along to thwart them. If they fail, they will prove the *science* right, condemn their race for decades more and hurt the war effort in the process. In glaring contrast, the white fighter pilots are never questioned or called cowards for their behavior. They risk the lives and missions of the bomber group, but are seen as heroic none-the-less.

When the Red Tail Squadron do prove themselves and effectively guard the bomber group, the meeting between these two factions is played up like a gang fight in the streets of Italy. The bomber leader appears to cat call them and finally they turn and face the men, finding that he merely wants to thank them. This exposes the assumptions of one group and the privilege of the other. The whites simply do not see that this interaction is threatening or meaningful, while the blacks assume that the man calling them is just harassing them. When they invite them into the Officers' Club, a similar confrontation follows, but is quickly extinguished and a discussion opens up as the two groups find themselves face to face with a reality apart from what they have known. To diffuse the tension, humor is employed. This scene risks a cliché that has risen in more recent decades: the uncomfortable race discussion between newly made friends.

In the Spike Lee drama, *Miracle at St. Anna*, race tensions are faced with similar devices as those in *Red Tails*. Just like the other film, there are characters who fit stereotypes, but then there are those who stand in opposition to accepted ideology. Both Stamps and Negron provide these oppositional images. Negron can speak Italian, negating the idea that blacks are undeducated. He and stamps are

brave, good men who don't back down from fire fights. The other two soldiers with them however, are

derivations of old stereotypes. Bishop is the rascal and a bit of the young buck, trying to have his way

with Renata the Italian girl in the village. He's vulgar and angry, vulgar because he is angry, and the

script tries to explain why falling into clichés. Lastly there is Sam Train. He's a kind young man and very

innocent, and deeply religious and superstitious. Though they are stereotypes, Lee uses them in a way

to challenge the concepts that created them, to see real men behind them and give a reason as to why

one might be like that, even if it does seem rehashed. This is most evident in Bishop's case. Bishop is

warring inside with faith and the real world. He talks with Train about his doubts, revealing a real person

underneath the act. He does believe in something greater than himself, but his anger is from his fear of

being disappointed yet again.

In both films, there is at least one character who has deeply felt Christian religious ties. They try

to teach the word of Jesus to all the others. In *St. Anna,* the idea of Christianity pervades the whole

story. It's what ties the people who populate the film together. There is a montage in which each group

is shown praying. The head of the statue that Sam Train carries takes the form of a religious idle that

also ties the groups together. Train believes it imbues him with certain powers. This makes the

symbolism of the head very important to the story. Whoever has it, according to Train, "is invisible and

has the strength of five men." He tells little Angelo this and tries to give it to Bishop to pay off his debt,

claiming it's worth a lot more than what he owes him from gambling. In Red Tails, one of the fliers

routinely praises *Black Jesus*.

The significance of the St. Anna head goes beyond religion and idolatry. Lee focuses on the head

as prime force in his film, a central symbol of the tale. It is a piece of antiquity and highly valued. The

head is white marble and the head of a woman. The connotations here are two fold. The head is

symbolic of the seat of knowledge and hence all that sets man apart from animals. To the viewer it is

communicated as a means for the heroes of the story to escape their situation. With it in their

possession, they have special powers and can even become invisible. To have this white woman's head

is to have knowledge and are therefore entitled to a seat at the table of man, a full member of the

human race. This is to say, they have what makes them equal with the whites who have subjugated

them for hundreds of years. The fact that Train thinks it makes him invisible, harkens to the idea of

white being the invisible race, the norm (Benshoff, 49). With it, they too become invisible and their color

is no longer of issue. The other factor of it being the head of a woman plays into the fears of

miscegenation. Lee also plays on this theme through the sexual encounter Bishop has with Renata.

Through women, they can attain invisibility. This meaning is a bit awkward to articulate, but it appears

the story calls for assimilation of the Black race by disappearing into the white one or overtaking it. This

leads me to wonder further if it is ever possible for minority filmmakers to create a film without

reflecting the ideology of the dominant culture. While watching the film and finding this meaning

unravel around the statue head, I could see something that seemed more decidedly white in its premise.

Though it is against racial purist views for races to sexually mix, there are those, that some still label

racist, who think the races should intermingle until the *other* is diluted out of existence. With my

personal experience and perspective, it is difficult to tell if my questions and suspicions could ever be

satisfactorily answered. It clearly is the filmmakers being able to at last bring up and discuss

miscegenation, symbolic and real. It will be interesting to see what is said of these films five or ten years

from now.

Regardless of the ambiguity, there is a clear message given by both films. "We fought for this

country too," Negron grinds out in the first few minutes of *St. Anna*. It's true. These films teach us that

the African American, though segregated and marginalized was called upon by the United States to

serve in time of need, and they met that call. They are awarded heroes, though history has glanced over

them. Many died defending the American way in each American war since the advent of the Union.

These films, by Negron's line, awaken us to the truth that their contribution has been little recognized.

Through the creation of these films, the African American reclaims their part in the national story. This does not take away from the rich history America has written for itself, but adds to it, giving those who were marginalized roots in the history of a nation they may have felt little or no connection with as outcasts. They are gaining control over their image on the screen, challenging concepts and the dominant ideology. The symbolism of the head in this case becomes a symbol of memory. Negron holds onto that head as proof to himself that it actually happened. With no stories of their service in the war told, that service becomes a dream and doubted. Having that head, the memory is grounded in physical proof. It is both witness of the events and the vessel of the memory of it.

Unlike Blacks, Jews had "virtual control of their own self-image on the screen," (Miller, 114). This is not to say that they escaped stereotyping or negative effects from their cultural differences in the United States. Patricia Erens speaks about their experience in her article "Between Two Worlds: Jewish Images in American Film." Erens goes into great detail about the beginnings of cinema and its relationship to the Jewish immigrants who had a substantial hand in its development. "Participation [in film exhibition and production] took little skill and little capital and, as a new industry, was open to immigrants; all newcomers were on an equal footing," (Miller, 115). The Jewish immigrants took advantage of this quickly. Jews, "as poor immigrants, were driven by the need to succeed," (Miller, 115). They had families to feed and a new world to acclimate to. Facing these hardships, this group of immigrants "had an overwhelming desire to prove themselves good Americans," (Miller, 115). They had faced hate and ignorance in the nations they left behind and hoped to get beyond such obstacles and achieve the American dream.

"They constructed an imaginary America for themselves and their mass audience. Dissolving divergent class, regional, and ethnic histories into a unifying American dream, the moguls propelled themselves from Hebraic particularism to American universalism," (Rogin, 1055). This was out of a drive to avoid the conflict they had escaped in the old world. Hoping for a better life and some guidance to

achieve it, "immigrants who sought social models, views of themselves, values to adopt, and frameworks with which to understand America frequently found them in movies," (Miller, 98). Film became a quick way to learn what was acceptable in America and what made an American an American. "Repudiating 1920s nativism, these films celebrate the melting pot," (Rogin, 1057). The cinema was used as a means to convince immigrants that it was best to leave their old ways behind and become wholly American. This was much easier for the younger generations. For example, "*The Jazz Singer* (1927) escapes his Jewish past in blackface," (Rogin, 1077). He changes his name and dons make up to become a symbol of the era, the Jazz Era, which was fed by the African subculture. However, "unlike African Americans…the white man in blackface could change the color of his skin," (Rogin, 1076-1077). All he had to do was wash the make-up off and he blended into the crowd. So too, a simple change or Anglicizing of their name cleared up any misgivings of who or what they were (Miller, 101).

Though it may seem that their job of assimilating or blending in was far easier than what the African American faced, their path was not without pitfalls. Not only did they have to abandon their identities and histories, they had to withstand judgmental stereotypes that hinted at conflict with the established dominant group. Early silent shorts portrayed Jews as "the butt of the joke, the scapegoat," (Miller 117). They frequently made a caricature of them with the "scheming Jewish merchant," and image that persists to this day (Miller, 117). "Drawing from literary sources, anti-Semitic caricatures have persisted, in each decade…one or two character types have been added," (Miller, 119). The ideology around these caricatures may seem to have improved, but they are still based on the old images, perhaps softened slightly for modern sensibilities. Another source of caricature or stereotyping was the foreign accent. Immigrants from other nations, of course, all had them. With the advent of sound, "Jewish accents were novel and a source of humor," (Miller, 121). Thusly, actors did not generally seek out roles that "labeled them as specifically Jewish," (Miller, 121). They wanted to blend and make their transition into their new society smoother, avoiding the conflicts they had escaped.

In comparison to the African-American, "although negative portrayals of Jews exist in film, little overt anti-Semitism occurs. The large number of Jews who held the reins of Hollywood's power prevented this," and, "because Jews made up a high percentage of the urban film audience, their interests could not be slighted," (Miller, 117). As I mentioned before, the African American is only more recently taking the reins of filmmaking and insisting on what kinds of stories will be made, something they were strongly denied until the 1970s. Jewish filmmakers had this sort of control from the beginning. They also worked in many facets of the film industry: Writing, directing, composing, acting, etc. (Miller, 116). Most preferred a position behind the scenes, a sign that holds the specter of their pasts (Miller, 121).

The cinema they created was a reflection of their culture. Topics included persecution, intermarriage and immigration, all examples of their struggles and a display that connected them with other peoples who would realize they were similar through such images (119-120).Yet, "Jewishness also placed a limit on the gentile dreams [Al] Jolson could interpret to his mass audience. A luminal figure, he was not permitted full, patriarchal authority. For the Jew to perform his transitional functions in classic Hollywood…he had to know his place," (Rogin, 1072). Though they might be able to blend in, they were still very aware that they were not Anglo-Saxon whites. With a history of persecution by the dominant groups they lived under, they were hard pressed to forget. Still, they held a hope that pushed them forward. "The Jazz singer's acting is the vehicle for changing identities in order to Americanize," (Rogin, 1071). Jakie sheds his Jewish identity, becoming Jack Robin. He even falls in love with a white girl, Mary Dale. Though this would be strictly forbidden by conventions of the time, "the specter of miscegenation, [is] defused when the racially ambiguous Jew dons blackface and thereby moves from the *Oriental* to the white category…California Law prohibiting miscegenation defined it as intermarriage between the white race and the *negro, mulatto, or Mongolian,*" (Rogin, 1061). Black face was strictly symbolic of a white patriarchal ideology. Non-whites could not accomplish this, so it gave Jakie a means to

Americanize or whiten. I would go further and say that it gave these groups a common straw man to single out and define themselves against. As Michael Rogin puts it, "the Jewish jazz singer Americanizes himself by appearing in blackface…racial cross-dressing enacts the pleasures and dangers surrounding not only race and ethnicity but also domestic and technological change," (Rogin, 1056). This cross-dressing did not clear the way for freedom to express themselves in any way they desired. In fact, they were still restrained by convention. Rogin tells us that "signifying on his Jewishness, playing with the stereotypes rather than challenging it, is also a sign of the narrow constraints within which he could assert his ethnicity,' (Rogin, 1076). They may have had control of the studios and how they were portrayed, but convention and ideology only permitted so much play within those borders. Stereotypes were employed to make easily recognizable images, and they victimized themselves in the pursuit of making their businesses successful. Going against this, the filmmakers could risk failure.

Other obstacles were yet to come. "During the 1930s a drastic decline in the number of Jewish characters on the screen occurred," (Miller, 122). Patricia Erens suggests three reasons: "tendency among Hollywood producers to appeal to the greatest numbers…sharp reduction in immigration beginning in 1924…lastly, the rise of Adolf Hitler." (Miller, 122). After all, cinema was a big business by this time and box office receipts were a concern of the stockholders and moguls. In order to keep going, they had to rake in the admission sales. To do so, they made sure their films had a wide appeal. With the rise of the Third Reich, they had learned from experience and reacted by keeping a low profile: "Jewish in name only," (122). They did not want to bring attention to themselves and face the hardships they had left behind in Europe, the persecution.

During the 1920s, Yiddish films rose in prominence out of a response to the immigration of European Jews to America. "The Yiddish cinema constitutes a body of approximately fifty works beginning in 1924 and running through 1961," (Miller, 123). They are marked by low budgets and deficient technical achievement (Miller, 123). This canon of film was "produced for ethnic audiences and

uninterested in appealing to non-Jewish viewers, the Yiddish cinema stresses tradition over

assimilation," whereas mainstream film stressed assimilation (Miller, 124). Greater "value on family

reconciliation and the continuation of the Jewish ethos," was another staple of these stories (Miller,

124). Having a smaller audience, they did not have the ability to produce lavish sets and pay the salaries

of Hollywood stars. But, the fact that they were made at all is a noteworthy accomplishment in itself.

They satisfied a niche and, if any are still in existence, would be an interesting counter narrative to

examine alongside the mainstream pictures of the day.

Curiously, "with the demise of the Yiddish cinema, the Jew virtually disappeared from the

screen. In Hollywood during the next era, the Jew became assimilated beyond recognition, thus

completing a tendency begun in the 1930s," (Miller , 124). Jewish actors took lesser roles, remained in

the background or stuck with minor positions (124-125). There were a few factors that played into this.

The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) "hearings had a heavy impact on many talented

Jews in Hollywood, and it is no secret that John Rankin, who officiated at the first investigations, was an

anti-Semite," (Miller, 126). Again, fear of persecution based on their history drove them into a semi-

hiding. Thankfully, this was not a permanent trend. In the 1950s, after HUAC lost its leverage, Jewish

concerns and characters reemerged, (Miller, 126-127).

In many films, "Jews overcome formidable enemies and emerge as victors. Such narratives carry

a latent message about Jewish survival and serve as a necessary antidote after the horrors of the

Holocaust," (Miller, 127). After surviving the horrors of World War II and the HUAC scare, they certainly

must have felt reaffirmed and much safer to speak out. This is evident as time went by and film leaned

toward depictions of "the proud Israeli with gun in hand. This image lent dignity to the Jewish character

who had for so long been depicted as a victim," (Miller, 127). Then, in the Late 1960s and the 1970s,

"Jews appear as major characters" once again (Miller 129). The cinematic stories being told in these

images showed a "growing concern with ethnic roots," (Miller 129). It seems like a natural progression,

after having had to hide their roots and identity for so many decades, being reaffirmed in the society by the Second World War, that they sought out those stories once more, yearning to reclaim Jewish identity. However, "some critics believe that" this period also included films that "constitute a new form of anti-Semitism based on Jewish self-hatred," but "the producers argue that it is a healthy sign when Jews can laugh at themselves in public," (Miller 130). Some examples of this cinema are as follow: In the "light drama and comedy" of the era, "the emphasis has been on being Jewish in America...the young heroes are oversexed, confused young men who are nevertheless accomplished in their fields. The heroines are graceless young women determined to find a man. The older generation comprises jaded businessmen or professionals and overbearing mothers," (Miller, 132). A newer depiction "has been in the appearance of the Jewish gangster...in the past Jewish criminals were carefully kept off the screen," (Miller, 132). "The Jews, both on screen and off, span the entire history of Hollywood cinema...Despite the stereotypes...the Jews' struggle between traditionalism and assimilation was the creative tension of Jews participating in the movies, as it was also in America," (Miller, 133).). I argue that they felt safer and wanted to explore themselves and how they were perceived, perhaps poking fun at what had been said in earlier years. This new found autonomy would make anyone stumble around trying to find their feet. It is also wise to keep in mind that self-deprecation has often been used as a tool to put others at ease, and make a successful transition into a new group. While some critics see self-loathing, this may be a sign of a group finally being accepted into the larger society, though not completely assimilated.

Another group who experienced a similar trajectory was the Irish. Though it may surprise people of today, the Irish were not considered white by the Anglo-Saxon dominant cultural group of America and were often called similar epitaphs as the African American, reminding them of their place in white society. Dennis Clark and William J. Lynch examine this position in their article "Hollyood and Hibernia: The Irish in the Movies." Clark and Lynch state that, "Like Irish immigrants in the mid-nineteenth century, Jewish movie producers, vaudeville performers, and songwriters occupied an insecure position

between whites and peoples of color…racial cross-dressing acknowledged the ambiguous racial status they occupied," (Rogin, 1052). Here they are speaking of a two-fold meaning. The Irish, like the Jews, also performed in blackface. The other meaning is in that they portrayed the dominant culture on stage and screen, dressing the part from costume to voice work (smoothing the Irish brogue to sound more Anglo). The Irish were closer to assimilating in that they already spoke English, but were usually barred from such acceptance because of their low income status (98). Still, there existed a "potential ability of Irish-Americans to manipulate their own and other ethnic colleagues and interests and to maneuver skillfully in an American culture with which they were highly conversant," (Miller, 103). In other words, they had the connection of language and an understanding of Anglo-Saxon cultural norms in order to at least pretend they fit in. Furthermore, their history on the stage provided business connections: "Jewish and Irish performers mixed freely in vaudeville," providing them with "links for later Hollywood connections," (Miller, 105). Business connections meant they had a better chance at achieving upward mobility and gaining status through income.

It is well known that the Irish "brought to America a culture rich in theatrical tradition, in which music, folk dancing, and storytelling proved happy assets to the stage and screen, as the country gradually accepted popular dramatic entertainment," (Miller, 99). Despite this rich tradition, which should have garnered them more respect, "the Irish, along with blacks, became the most commonly mocked group…caricatures of Irish politicians, fire brigade commanders, and saloon owners…prejudicial posturing that passed for dramatic presentation of the Irish," (Miller, 99). Some of the familiar stereotypes portrayed of the Irish included: "the bumbling servant, the braggart fortune seeker, the reckless lover and the wild Irish girl," also, "the drunken *boyo*, the braggart greenhorn, *Brigid* the clumsy maid, *Tim* the dumb cop, and *Paddy* the burly laborer" (Miller, 100). Under the studio system, Irish actors were often pigeon-holed into a few basic genres: "*The Gangster Film*—since the Irish were the nation's prime contenders for criminal eminence throughout the 1920s…archetypal lawless urban Irish

thug…*The Military Film*…movies in which the Irish were invariably enlisted men…courageous, patriotic, but basically *dumb and dogged* fighter…*The Irish Family Film*—the raucous Irish domestic scene…about feuding Irish families….*The Adventure Films*…the Irishman as dashing, devil-may-care swashbuckler…*The Cowboy Film*…always a tough cavalry sergeant…his charges, enlisted men all, were inevitably heavy-drinking, saloon-busting Irishmen. *The Religious Film*…the Catholic priest as a two-fisted, charming, often musical figure who fought or sang his way into the souls of his flock. *The' Old Country' Film*…often romantic, unrealistic portraits of Irish life," (Miller, 105-106). *Stock* images of the Irish faded after the studio system dissolved sometime during the 1950s, most likely due to an opening in positions on the creative end (Miller, 111). Clark and Lynch assert that despite the offensive nature of these roles, they were "seldom consciously offensive" (Miller, 100). That notion is key to understanding how stereotyping and marginalizing comes into power. As Benshoff and Griffin mention, race ideas were "allegedly *scientific,"* and "highly dependent upon social, ideological and historical concepts," (Benshoff, 47, 48). In other words, white privilege formed ideas about race, for it was their perspectives and ideas that decided such concepts at the time (and some rightly argue that is so to this day), but not everyone held these ideas with cruel intentions.

Some examples of this concept are how the dominant group stereotyped "both Jews and Irish as boorish, loud, stubborn, crude and given to humorous mishandling of the English language," (Miller, 100). Their control of the mainstream of society saw that this "tradition of the stereotyped stage Irishman continued through the studios' heyday, and even during their decline it was never really expunged," (Miller, 100). After all, it was what they believed about the Irish and the players could not sell a role that was unbelievable. Stereotyped images of the Irish can still easily be seen today.

Although the "Irish were reflected on the screen, often simplistically and at best, as in the *Irish Freedom* films, ambiguously," they were employed "behind the scenes…as writers, promoters, agents, directors, and publicity men," (Miller, 107). Sometimes, the groups themselves helped the concepts of

stereotypes to be propagated. For instance, negative impacts from outside of film included Irish Catholic vigilance system (Production Code), who annoyed moviegoers for decades with their attempts to censor content. Also, the House UnAmerican Activities Committee (HUAC) and Senator Joseph McCarthy (Miller, 108-109) left a painful legacy behind that only proved the widely held ideas of boorish and stubborn Irishmen.

Yet, despite the negative images, studios demanded actors who sounded Irish, (Miller, 100-101). Irish names "were acceptable on movie billboards," (Miller, 101). This sounds strange, considering the experience of blacks and Jews, who had to hide their identity or stand in the background. The reason behind it was that "the Irish were common coin in the country, and their names were generally pronounceable," (Miller, 101). Clark and Lynch are saying that because such enormous numbers of Irish immigrated to the United States, their numbers insisted on greater deference. This deference did not extend to telling fair stories about the Irish or considering them outside of an Anglo-Saxon interpretation of identity. This identity had been long forming, with roots in the old world, from which both groups had long ties.

Though the Irish held positions in the studios and could, like the Jews, have control over their image, that did not happen. They go on to point out that "script writing…never drew sufficient exercise of talent or attention to bring to the screen the keen realities of Irish-American experience," (Miller, 102). The talent wasn't drawn because writers were instead hired "to provide stock scripts," not write enduring classics that would be lauded for all time (Miller, 102). Yet, there are enduring examples of the Irish in both those who worked behind the scenes as well as in front, (Miller 103). John Ford is one example, a well-known and beloved director (Miller, 103). Still, the examples are results of assimilation. The John Ford cannon of cinema is a list of films that contain all the above stereotypes and forward the ideology of the nation, and Ford was an Irishman.

By the time of this article, there were no films that "even tried to comprehend the huge subject of Irish immigration and its implications," (Miller, 109). Clark and Lynch lament "the Irish have become more assimilated into the American mainstream, it is just possible that they may have lost some of their individuality and their color," (Miller, 111). Fortunately, cinema has been leaning toward telling stories centered more on individual experience and highlighting the obstacles the underdog must overcome. I would argue that we now have such a film as Clark and Lynch were looking for. *Gangs of New York* (2002) is the tale of the Irish in America. It gets into all the ugly details of life in the Five Points, using stereotypes to draw in the audience with something familiar and then challenging that ideology by contrasting it with the Anglo-Saxon oppressor that drives the narrative of the story. It basically says, if the Irish were ugly, then so too were the so-called Americans who abused them. *Far and Away* (1992) attempted to do the same, but it's more light-hearted approach seemed to miss the mark and fall into the same vein as the John Ford Irish films before it. It is arguably inspired by Ford's films. After all, Shannon is the ditzy Bridgette, though moneyed and far more educated than her love interest. Joseph is just another stubborn and boorish Irishman. What's more, the entire film is about how Joseph must tame the wild Shannon and seek his due on the frontier. *Gangs,* though it makes use of stereotypes, gives a history and meaning to why they exist. It is the circumstances and the world that molds the few opportunities that make Amsterdam's behavior. Neither does he seek to tame Jenny, as much as rescue her from her fate, the fate of all of the Irish in Five Points who live at the mercy of Bill 'The Butcher.' Jenny thus becomes symbolic of Ireland, under threat of the English and following a bad path because all other opportunity has been denied her.

In viewing the images of the Irish on the screen, I am often struck by the persistent stereotypes. I even laughingly call the images and songs attached to this group racist. They're not painful, but do strike an uncomfortable cord. I find that it echoes the sentiments of the Jewish filmmaker in poking fun

at their cultural group and how some view this as self-hatred. I think that this is indicative of both groups

being just on the edge, neither fully accepted nor fully rejected by the White social structure.

The last group I wish to discuss are the Germans in American cinema. Daniel J. Leab, discusses

these images in his article "Deutschland, USA: German Images in American Film." To understand them

as clearly as the rest, it is also important understand the history of this group in America. Though some

came in the early colonial days of America, the greatest number of German immigrants came to the

United States during the mass immigrations. Leab says, "Immigrants from Germany—came to America

in large numbers during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," (Miller, 156). Their transition was

slow and they "did not become assimilated" right away due to language barriers and "factional

disputes," (157). By factional disputes, he means infighting among the subgroups of German immigrants

such as political groups and the demarcations of economic strata. He adds, in regards to American views

of Germans, the "general attitude was not hostile," but films portraying them "retained somewhat

negative connotations," (Miller, 158-159). They were considered "all-alike," and "strange" (158). It can

be easily imagined that these attitudes came from the difficulty of understanding someone who did not

speak the language. Other obstacles against their blending in with American society were that they were

the "first serious exponents of Marxism in America" and were "aggressive partisans of nonbelief and

freethinking," (Miller, 158). Marxism has long been heralded as the antithesis to American democracy, a

social structure very much in favor of conformity (Benshoff, 51).

The German immigrant suffered very similar stereotyping as the other groups listed above. In

what Leab illustrates, they seemed to have fared a little better until the advent of both World Wars. The

usual cinematic image of that embodied them was the "stereotyped German civil servant," (Miller, 159).

This image came along with others that showed them as "tenement dwellers with limited imagination,"

and insisted that they existed on the "low end of the social spectrum" with "brutal" attitudes that made

them look like "libidinous, sadistic bullies" (Miller, 164-165, 172). And, of course, there was always an emphasis on their *guttural* accents (Miller, 172).

After the start of World War I, the German became the archetypal villain derisively nicknamed the Hun (Miller 160-166). With the war, a "wave of anti-German hysteria swept across the United States in 1917 and 1918 (Miller, 162). Cinema quickly turned to portraying "villains with German sounding names or German-style uniforms," (Miller, 162). In reaction to the war and Allied propaganda, Germans (whether American or actually German) became the enemy and a campaign of "renaming became a popular pastime," from food to comic strips, something that was reinvigorated by the United States Republican Party more recently, when a wave of anti-French sentiment swept the country and gave us *Freedom Fries*(Miller, 162-163). Leab also discussed how "the propaganda-oriented American film industry participated with a vengeance," and began a campaign of its own to slander the *enemy* and show how German-Americans were a threat to the nation (Miller, 163-164). One has to wonder if the filmmakers, being of Jewish descent or Jewish immigrants from nations near Germany or Germany itself, had an axe to grind with this particular branch of society. With the cinema at their disposal, they could finally voice what they thought of the German, after having been so long subjugated and silenced in the old country. However, with the close of the war, attitudes quickly changed, so it is an unsure assumption at best. This switch was reflected in the Films of the "1920s and early 1930s that did depict German-Americans, [which] softened the prewar stereotypes," (Miller, 166). In Leab's words: "Hate had given way to sympathy and compassion," (167). The film *Grand Hotel* (1932) is a good example of this change, along with *Frankenstein* (1931) and *Bride of Frankenstein* (1935). These films provide stereotypical portrayals, but they are much kinder than the image of the brutal Hun. For instance, the character of Kringelien is the civil servant in all his unimaginative pathetic dullness. Yet, Kringelien becomes a very sympathetic character the viewer will fall in love with. He's a very good man, who was too busy working to live until he finds out he's going to die soon. Subjugated by another stereotype in the form of General

Director Prysling, a man of money and libido with a horribly stereotypical accent, the average viewer immediately identifies with Kringelien's struggle. The doctor who lives in the hotel is a Word War I vet, made obvious by his terrible facial scarring. The fact that they mentioned German veterans is a sign that the wounds were healing or had healed by the time the film was made. In both *Frankenstein* films, a similar formula plays out. You see townspeople dressed in lederhosen and beer garden dresses, the rich men wear alpine hats with the telltale brush feather. This costuming is meant to assure you they are German, because most of the actors do not attempt even the worst version of a German accent. On the whole, their image is favorable and viewed compassionately.

This compassion was to be short lived. As common history tells us, "Adolf Hitler's accession to power in 1933 and the ensuing Nazification of Germany resulted in another swing in public opinion," (Miller, 169). With the lessons of the previous war fresh in their minds, "German-Americans feared that a failure on their part to speak out against Hitler and Nazism would be construed as support and might result in another wave of anti-German hysteria," (Miller 169). However, they did not just pretend to despise this regime. There were true "feelings of revulsion and contempt aroused in the German-American community by Nazi Germany's domestic and foreign policies," (Miller, 169). This revulsion helped to prevent a rise of Nazism in the United States. According to Leab, "The Nazi movement in the United States had virtually no success because it failed to receive more than marginal German-American support," (Miller, 169). After proving their loyalty in the previous war with Germany, and aligned themselves unquestioningly against this new regime, "there was little fear on the home front that people of German descent owed a divided allegiance," (Miller, 174).

The dynamics of World War II were much different than the previous war. This time, "the American movie industry exercised great caution in its approach to the subject of Germany." The industry preferred to instead address the conflict it limitedly and indirectly, or in a coded manner, (Miller, 170). At this time, the conflict was still largely just a European concern. American studios still

sent their films overseas to the German markets. Therefore, "the lucrative German market…was a factor in the industry's hesitancy in producing films dealing with Nazi Germany," (Miller, 171). Oddly, this avoidance continued once US involvement was secured. Perhaps to avoid offending the German-American market, "it was the evil that was emphasized in the myriad number of anti-German films that were produced by American movie industry once the United States entered the war," (Miller, 172, 174). This was a tactic of propaganda as well, hoping to incite sympathies for those under the yoke of tyranny, a theme familiar to Americans in their colonial history. A prewar film that best illustrates this is *The Mortal Storm* (1940). The narrative follows a German family through the rise of Hitler, showcasing the varying emotions toward the Nazi Party's rise to power. The patriarch of the family is a kindly old man and a professor at a University. The film challenges Nazi conceptions of racial superiority, which they claimed to be in the blood. At the time, genetic sciences were coming into vogue, but the Nazi Party rejected this science as it debunked their beliefs in Aryan perfection. The movie also illustrates the fervor felt by the young people of Germany, using the Professor's two sons, his daughter Freya and their friends who immediately get swept up. The character of Martin Breitner (James Stewart) is the foil to this energy. He, like the professor, are not comfortable with what has come to their country. His reluctance, as well as the father's, keep Freya undecided between the factions for most of the film. Martin and the Professor are men of science and reason and do not agree with the policies the Nazis will put into place and see their duty to stop their loved ones from making a big mistake by supporting the Nazis. The action culminates in Martin, who tried to convince the others of the error of their ways, trying to escape over the Alps with Freya. Martin escapes, but the Germans are able to shoot Freya (the soldiers are led by Martin's rival and friend). This film goes a long way to setting up the idea that despite all that is going on inside the borders of Germany, there are those who are victims of the tyranny, and those who will not raise a hand for fear of it.

Another film from just before the war leans toward more openly showing the atrocities that the German's were capable of. At the time *Underground* (1941) was made, very little was known of just what was going on inside the borders of this nation, and the information received by the Allied forces was only leaked out in tiny bits, as an Interview with the director (Vincent Sherman) suggests. Critics of the film panned the movie as going too far. Sherman definitely intended to make his picture an anti-Nazi film, but it was later found out that images he created were mild in comparison to the truth. Sherman cites the status of the German state in the world as partly what prevented Americans from believing what was happening. The other part was the thoroughly horrendous activities, which were just too much to take as truth.

The film *Underground* follows the attempts of a German resistance group to thwart the efforts of the SS and the Nazi party as a whole. They broadcast radio transmissions, trying to convince the people to fight against the regime and exposing the truth that is in front of the citizens. They have operatives within the SS and among the common citizens. To ground the story, they tell it through a pair of brothers, one who has returned mutilated from the war (Kurt) and the other who does the broadcasting (Eric). Kurt is gung-ho proponent of the Nazi propaganda. He claims he was glad to give up his arm for his country, displaying how far the Nazi's have gone in convincing their people of the rightness of the effort. Eric coldly acknowledges the wound, harkening back to old stereotypes. Navigating the perils of resisting Hitler, Eric's group risks all convinced of their own efforts and rightness. Like in *The Mortal Storm*, the German military uniform is prominently displayed as a symbol of the German State's control over its people. From Kurt to the SS man hunting his brother, the uniform is a badge of supreme faith and compliance in the German machine. Because they wear this uniform, they can do no wrong, even when beating women (Sylvia the resistance fighter and love interest for the brothers) and old men (Kurt and Eric's father). Their abuses are most clearly illustrated in Hoffman, a former resistance fighter who has been interred at a concentration camp. They release him with a

promise to never have to return if he will give up the identities of the others. Having spent so much time in the prison and suffered unnamed tortures, he reluctantly agrees. Hoffman's appearance is disheveled, desperate and mad. His eyes are always large and shifty. He is a broken man. When confronted by the resistance for helping the Nazis, he decides to take his own life instead of returning to prison for failing to give up his friends. This tells the audience that things are so bad, people would rather take their own lives than comply.

Vincent Sherman was soon to be vindicated. Reports came to America about the truth behind the Nazi plans, backed up by news reel images. This was a hard blow to the German-Americans who had already faced fierce hatred during the First World War. Leab states that "the immediate postwar revelations of Nazi atrocities inside Germany and elsewhere in Europe tended to keep people from avowing ethnic pride in being of German descent, and the already diminished German-American community suffered accordingly…they have been absorbed into the mainstream of American society," (Miller, 174-175). However, a result of this absorption is that "German society has been refurbished by the movies, and other media, and made a victim of rather than an accessory to the Nazis," (Miller, 176). Perhaps this came from a need of the larger society to help them navigate and accept similar histories in the American past.

As seen with other groups, the attention of American society shifted to a new evil. In the red flag of the Soviet Union, "Communism almost overnight replaced Nazism as the supreme evil threatening the American way of life…Germany…became America's staunchest ally…the Russians became the new bête noire," (Miller, 175). Today it is not uncommon to find audiences rooting "for the Germans against the Russians," (Miller, 178). Neither is it strange to watch the news and see the American president beside the leader of Germany, or hear how the German's are leading the way toward a better future through clean energy initiatives.

In conclusion, I find that I agree with the statement that "performers themselves can do only so much toward shaping attitudes. To step outside the perimeters of familiar character spoils the cozy relationship between actor and audience, weakens the power of the stereotype, and discredits the burden of its political message," (Miller, 18). The images on the screen are fleeting, meaning they have just so much time to communicate and connect with the audience. The statement must be simple and clear. And, to make its greatest impact, it often speaks to the dominant group. The images on the screen are often intentionally stereotypical, but just as often it may be intended to make the viewer question such a statement. "Social scientists, and others concerned with the impact of film on public opinion are sharply divided as to whether movies influence an audience, or whether they mirror its ideas," (Miller, 161). From the examples of films contained here and the readings done along with them, it becomes no clearer that one influences the other. It is a complex relationship that appears to display a reciprocal influence through a frenzy of multi-layered information. Film has the power to bring new ideas to the minds of the viewer, but it can also be used to just affirm already held beliefs. Likewise, behind each film is a group of human beings, a conglomerate of perspectives and experiences responsible for putting the film into existence. Ideology is inescapable. It is important to view film with care.

Works Cited

Benshoff, Harry M., and Sean Griffin. <u>America on Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality at the Movies</u>. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Miller, Randall M., ed. <u>The Kaleidoscopic Lens: How Hollywood Views Ethnic Groups</u>. Englewood: Jerome S. Ozer, Publisher, 1980.

Rogin, Michael. "Making America Home: Racial Masquerade and Ethnic Assimilation in the Transition to Talking Pictures." <u>The Journal of American History</u> 79.3 (Dec., 1992): 1050-1077.

Tasker, Yvonne. <u>Working Girls: Gender and Sexuality in Popular Cinema</u>. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Willis, Sharon. <u>High Contrast: Race and Gender in Contemporary Hollywood Film</u>. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.