Introduction

Past and Present

A study of Jewish identities in German popular entertainment seems particularly timely given the recent attention paid to German artists and performers working both in Germany and abroad. Berlin, Germany's old and new capital, has once again become a showcase for German intensity and innovation. Not only do the locals identify Berlin as one of Europe's emerging cultural metropolises; countless international travel guides second their claim. A rich and colorful nightlife, a kaleidoscope of innovative artists, live performances by the leading actors of our times – there is no doubt that Berlin attracts an extraordinary mixture of talent and voyeurs. The city's eclectic architecture, its contested spaces, its relics and monuments – sites of kitsch and creativity – are simultaneously experienced and reflected upon; the true Berliner is a self-conscious stranger, drawn to a city of lights and construction sites. Quite literally, Berlin is set on the border where the East meets the West, the past the present, and where the avant-garde coexists with a seemingly unfazed Berlin bourgeoisie. Today, as it had in the 1920s, Berlin's unique energy stems in part from great social and political turmoil: a war, a revolution, the need to redefine Germany's role within the European community. Are we then experiencing the renaissance of the "Golden Twenties" in a unified Germany?

On second thought, however, today's Berlin is nothing like the metropolis of the 1920s. The most noticeable difference is the almost complete absence of an active and integrated Jewish community. During the Nazi era, German society underwent a devastating cultural self-amputation; its slow and painful recovery took a decidedly different course than in the interwar period. "Jewish Berlin," despite the recent immigration of Jews from the former Soviet Union, is largely a fading memory, historicized in museums and memorial sites, visitable as a place but rarely habitable. Berlin's latest cultural revival has unfolded with only marginal participation from Germany's postwar Jewish community. Its creative energy results mainly from tension-filled dialogues between Ossis and Wessis, Turks and Germans, Berliners

and the rest of the world. At the turn of the last century, German Jews carried a significant responsibility for Berlin's extraordinary cultural diversity. Today, however, German-Jewish culture is a culture of remembrance, of nostalgia at times, but still too rarely one of live pleasure, excitement, and confident participation. This study thus is motivated by two primary concerns: a fascination with the colorful lives of performers working in an extraordinary sphere of German daily life, and a belief that remembering Germany's Jews also entails reflecting on the balance between the hopes and opportunities and the discrimination and disappointments that governed many Jewish lives in Germany.

Though Jews have lived and worked in modern Germany in many fascinating ways, the multiplicity of their experiences is hardly accounted for. In particular, arenas outside classic tales of heroism have been left mostly unexplored. While we find numerous references to extraordinary intellectuals such as Moses Mendelssohn and Rahel Levin, to economic leaders such as Gerson Bleichröder and Emil Rathenau, and to pathbreaking scientists such as Albert Einstein, we still lack studies of the less articulate. This book attempts to rectify the imbalance by exploring the astonishing subtlety in the humor and art of the barely literate, of those German Jews who spoke in unfamiliar ways, turning their bodies into metaphors. Furthermore, this book was born out of an appreciation for the sharp wit of countless actors whose jokes amused even those spectators who claimed to have already seen and heard everything. This then is a study of Jewish men and women who performed in a variety of entertainment venues – as circus ballerinas, variety artists, theater directors, stage divas, popular composers. They all saw Germany's entertainment industry as an effective way for them to engage with the majority culture. This book explores the terms of this engagement and, more important, pays homage to the many ways in which German Jews were instrumental in the birth of an incomparably rich popular culture. At the turn of the twentieth century, there was a colorful life beyond the well-tempered clavier for Germany's Jewry that demands to be rediscovered.

THE POLITICS OF REMEMBRANCE: WHEN DEATH OVERSHADOWS LIFE

Few historiographies have been as intensely preoccupied with questions of memory and forgetting as have the writings on modern German-Jewish history. For obvious reasons remembrance has become both a motivator and a subject for generations of historians. Time has only increased the intensity with which we try to process and commemorate the Holocaust as the quintessential modern genocide. In the shadow of such monstrous events, it is hardly surprising that most memory work has focused on the acts of persecution: the systematic isolation, concentration, and destruction of Europe's Jews. The extraordinary violence of these events, enabled by the disheartening indifference of Gentile bystanders, continues to trouble scholars. More recently, historians have shifted their attention from the perpetrators

to the victims. To account for their voices is now identified as an essential step in the maturation of Western societies. Charles Taylor has reminded us how the recognition of survivor testimonies has become a crucial test for democracies today: mutual recognition functions as the main path to civic equality, whereas forgetting results in the rejection of a "politics of difference."[1] To recognize Jewish victims of the Nazi genocide means to reclaim their humanity, a status systematically denied them by their persecutors. This humanity, however, remains at the center of many recent controversies. As the writer Stan Nadolny has so aptly put it: "One can hardly cherish someone's memory solely by imagining him or her as a dead body in Auschwitz, thinking about what has been done to him or her. Instead one should see the human being they have been before: full of hope, love (evilness too, please!) and full of pleasure in activity, confidence in victory."[2] The question thus seems to be not only whether to remember, but what to remember of modern Jewish life in Germany.

The notion of "normality" in Gentile–Jewish relations prior to the Holocaust, no matter how fragile, remains for many today inconceivable. However, if empathy is one principle objective for any historian, how can we accept memory work that does not allow lively and confident voices to emerge from the past? We could, for example, react to the image of a Jewish strong man performing before a largely Gentile audience by being overwhelmed with a sense of impending tragedy. Yet, isn't it even more frivolous to implicitly endorse Jewish marginalization in modern German society by commemorating only their victimization under the Nazis? What is it really that we do not wish to forget about Germany's Jews? How can we prevent the commemoration of their deaths from leading to a denial of the complexity and richness of their lives?

In light of the ultimate failure of Jewish integration into German society, historians of Imperial Germany have – maybe rightly so – focused on the limitations of Gentile–Jewish relations, that is, on their unresolved conflicts and disappointments. Anti-Semitism looms large in many of these studies of the pre-Holocaust era. Yet anti-Semitism alone rarely fully explains the success or failure of Jewish entertainment enterprises. For example, political and social anti-Semitism were active during the heyday as well as during the decline of *Jargon* theaters. Therefore this study suggests that anti-Semitism needed to interact with other forces in society before it seriously harmed Jewish popular performers. It was only in combination with xenophobia, radical

[1] Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in Amy Gutmann, ed., *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton, NJ, 1999), 38.

[2] Stan Nadolny, "Abstand vom Holocaust. Finkelsteins Mut und seine Fehler," in Petra Steinberger, ed., *Die Finkelstein-Debatte* (Munich, 2001), 185; similarly, James E. Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust* (Bloomington, IN, 1988), 187, cited in Pamela Ballinger, "The Culture of Survivors: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Memory," *History and Memory*, vol. 10, no. 1 (Spring 1998), 120.

nationalism, and militarism, that anti-Semitism gained the new quality that ultimately closed these spaces for Gentile–Jewish encounters.

We have come to consider the nature of these encounters with great pessimism. While Jewish integration into German society at the turn of the last century was certainly not complete, there were areas, such as popular entertainment, in which German Jews demonstrated surprising ease in their interaction with the Gentile majority. Although German anti-Semitism was clearly a force that Jewish performers reckoned with in the past, many did so with zest and confidence. We thus have to remind ourselves that there was a time in which their confidence seemed justified and their future held promise. Whereas "normality" in the prewar days did not mean for Jews the absence of open hostility, it did mean for many Jewish entertainers the possibility of intimacy and friendship with Gentile colleagues, continuous and fruitful work relations, professional advancement, and potential economic success.

For too long the marginalization of Jewish life in postwar Germany has allowed us to forget the important role German Jews played in establishing Berlin as one of the most vibrant entertainment centers in turn-of-the-century Europe. Even recent attempts to reconstruct Jewish life in Berlin reflect a decidedly selective public memory. Because of the renovation of its imposing Synagogue on Oranienburger Strasse, the Scheunenviertel, a working-class, ghetto-like quarter in East Berlin, has become the predominant site for a postwar engagement with Jewish history and culture in Berlin, a choice that also favors a popular historical narrative in which Jews are almost exclusively perceived as strangers. The life at the periphery, particularly the life of Eastern European immigrants, has increasingly become universalized as "the Jewish experience" in Germany. But klezmer music, Middle Eastern food, religious artifacts, and constant references to Israel are remnants of a past that was hardly a lived reality for the majority of Germany's Jewry before 1933. Why do we identify the Scheunenviertel as the predominant site of remembrance for Jewish life and culture in Berlin, instead of turning to the fashionable quarter of the Tiergarten or the upper-middle-class "Bavarian" neighborhood in Schöneberg? Which Jewish community do we wish to remember?

To date, the Holocaust and its aftermath have provided a pervasive interpretative framework within which we discuss and understand German Jews in the early twentieth century mainly as future victims.[3] This study probes the limits of this interpretative framework to recapture the life stories

[3] Binjamin Wilkomirski, *Fragments* (Schocken, 1996); Philip Gourevitch, "The Memory Thief," *The New Yorker*, June 14, 1999, 48–68; Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston, 1999); Stefan Mächler, *Der Fall Wilkomirski. Über die Wahrheit einer Biographie* (Zürich, 2000); Norman Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering* (London and New York, 2003); for the German and Swiss receptions, see Steinberger, *Die Finkelstein-Debatte;* Ernst Piper, ed., *Gibt es wirklich eine Holocaust-Industrie? Zur Auseinandersetzung um Norman Finkelstein* (Zürich, 2001).

of German Jews that are often overshadowed by an exclusive focus on Jewish victimhood. It aims to broaden our knowledge of Germany's important Jewish communities and hopes to increase our understanding of the challenges, opportunities, and paradoxes Jewish men and women faced prior to 1933. No easy answers will be provided for fascism's rise in Germany and its relationship to preexisting German anti-Semitism. If anything, this study may make ongoing controversies even more complex by adding diversity to the representation of the German-Jewish experience in the early twentieth century. This study suggests that at a certain place in time in Germany there was room for and appreciation of public display of various ethnic, and especially of Jewish, identities. We will explore both the significance and the fragility of this public engagement with Jewish lives and culture within a society riddled by conflicts, continuously torn between contradictory desires to reject, control, or celebrate individual and collective differences.

The decades prior to 1933 are too easily seen as merely a prelude to the Holocaust, with portentous signs of moral decay and social disintegration in abundance. It has once again become popular to equate assimilation with the false consciousness that is a symptom of self-denial among Germany's Jews.[4] Yet an analysis of popular entertainment demonstrates that German society was characterized by astounding contradictions. While Jews experienced glass ceilings and open hostility in the military and in politics, they enjoyed freedom and open doors in other endeavors, most notably in popular culture. The evolution of German popular culture between 1890 and the late 1920s was initiated and facilitated by Jewish entertainers and entrepreneurs, so much so that it makes sense to argue that the history of popular culture in Germany prior to 1933 cannot be separated from the history of Jewish entertainers.

There is, in fact, plenty of evidence that German-Jewish performers, directors, and producers were never more in the limelight than they were in the early twentieth century. This study intends to recall the nameless and the famous, the brilliant and the mediocre, Jewish actors in German entertainment. On stage and off, these entertainers both shaped and reflected the dreams and aspirations of countless Germans, who seemed to find unabated pleasure in the exhilarating amusement of live entertainment during these decades. As turn-of-the-century popular entertainment created new spheres of sociability and enterprise, it also created gray areas of Gentile–Jewish relations, blurring and redrawing the boundaries between insiders and outsiders in a process that this study attempts to capture and explore. By analyzing the aesthetics of performance and the social relations of entertainers, one gains insight into the complex relationships in Germany between Gentiles and Jews in the cultural realm as well as in the larger society.

[4] Daniel Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York, 1996).

GERMANS AT PLAY

By the turn of the twentieth century, the boundaries of the bourgeois ideal of *Bildung* (self-formation) began to be openly challenged. An expanding urban popular culture, as reflected in films, tabloids, and sport events, fundamentally altered social reality for many Germans.[5] Traditional forms of artistic expression began to seem increasingly stale, elitist, and uninspiring. Yet film, radio, and television were not the first mass media to leave their mark on the collective consciousness of the German population.[6] Antecedents such as the circus inspired the imagination of mass audiences around the turn of the century. By far the most popular form of mass entertainment, the circus annually drew millions of spectators, for whom it provided information as well as amusement.[7] To a significant degree, the circus influenced its spectators' notions of foreign worlds, as well as their ideas about the relationship between nature and mankind. In circus entertainment as elsewhere, "the medium was the message."[8] Moreover, the circus employed its own technological apparatuses to convey its messages. Along with *Jargon* theaters and revue theaters, circuses formed part of an entertainment industry that catered to the growing urban population of Imperial and Weimar Germany, and their primacy as popular diversions remained unchallenged until the arrival of cinema.[9]

Live entertainment was an important element in the everyday life of many Germans. As their leisure time increased, more and more Germans sought out

[5] See, among others, Kaspar Maase, *Grenzenloses Vergnügen: Der Aufstieg der Massenkultur, 1850–1970* (Frankfurt a. M., 1997).

[6] Pierre Sorlin, *Mass Media: Key Ideas* (London, 1994). Although an excellent introduction to the vast literature on "mass culture," Sorlin's book is representative of that literature in its neglect of popular entertainment forms prior to film.

[7] The average circus could seat between 2,500 and 5,000 spectators at each show. Each circus performed at least twice a day, and even the traveling circuses performed at least six months of the year. If we assume that a traveling circus performed 120 days in a year, it reached approximately 600,000 spectators during that time. A stationary circus, which performed throughout the year, annually averaged more than two million spectators.

[8] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media* (New York, 1964), 32.

[9] Bim Mason, *Street Theatre and Other Outdoor Performance* (London, 1992), 17. An excellent introduction to the history of European circuses is also provided in Jewgeni Kusneszow, *Der Zirkus der Welt* (Berlin, 1970); on German circuses, see also Dietmar Winkler, *Zirkusgeschichte* (Berlin, 1986); Robert A. Jones, *Art and Entertainment: German Literature and the Circus, 1890–1933* (Heidelberg, 1985); Joseph Halperson, *Das Buch vom Zirkus, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Wanderkünstlerwelt* (Düsseldorf, 1926); Günter Bose and Erich Brinkmann, *Circus. Geschichte und Ästhetik einer niederen Kunst* (Berlin, 1978); Wolfgang Carlé, *Das hat Berlin schon mal gesehn: Eine Historie des Friedrichstadt-Palastes* (Berlin, 1982); G. B. Eberstaller and Paul Christian, *Circus* (Vienna, 1976); J. Merdert, ed., *Zirkus, Circus, Cirque*, 28, Berliner Festwoche, Nationalgalerie (Berlin, 1978); a quite different approach to circus art is taken by Paul Bouissac, *Circus and Culture: A Semiotic Approach* (Bloomington, IN, 1976).

theaters, circuses, sports events, and trade fairs for distraction, excitement, and stimulation. In articles on the front pages of daily newspapers, a well-informed group of critics discussed the premieres of live productions. This high profile in the press was crucial to the ability of these shows to attract a mass audience, since Berliners in particular relied heavily on newspapers to map out the imaginative landscape of their urban environment.[10] This fascination with popular live entertainment was not confined to Berlin. On the contrary, every medium-sized city took pride in its circuses and theaters. City dwellers were well acquainted with the area's stars and with their private lives and public scandals. Provincial towns swelled with enthusiasm and pride at the occasional guest performance by a prominent entertainer from Berlin. Local politicians found it indispensable to be seen at these events, and local elites made sure to frequent the latest shows, where they sought the friendship of up-and-coming entertainers. Although Berlin celebrated itself as the capital of live entertainment, most of the city's larger theaters and circuses believed that their success depended on their shows' being discussed throughout the country.

POPULAR CULTURE AND JEWISH IDENTITY

Any exploration of the realm of circuses, *Jargon* theaters, and revue theaters must consider how Jews were represented in German popular media, as well as how their representations were received by Gentile and Jewish audiences. To provide a multifaceted view of Jewish identities in popular entertainment it is necessary to focus on both the production and the reception of popular culture. We have to ask when did individual artists invoke their ethnic identity over other dimensions of their lives, such as age, gender, or class, and why? How did Jewish performers use visual and verbal forms of language to express their need to belong or their sense of self? How did Jewish artists balance their individual histories and traditions with the collective's? Such questions move beyond an analysis of cultural organizations; they are an attempt to understand the fluid processes of identity formation and self-representation that engaged a predominant ethnic minority in modern Germany. This study illustrates the way in which popular entertainment in a particular time and place defined and expanded the boundaries of what was socially and culturally tolerated. It does so by evaluating the stage and the circus ring as public spaces that simultaneously informed and reflected the public's view of "the other."

Live popular entertainment is a particularly rich field for the study of ethnic identity. Its analysis provides insight into German society because it

[10] Peter Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin 1900* (Cambridge, MA, 1996).

encourages extensive interaction between performers and their audiences.[11] Long before postmodernism provoked heated debate among intellectuals about the "location of culture" – about who could or should claim responsibility for the production of meaning – German performers in circuses, variety shows, cabarets, and musical theaters understood that the success of their aesthetic enterprises lay in how they were received by audiences.[12] These new forms of popular entertainment fostered greater intimacy between audiences and performers. Many acts were choreographed as a ritualized dialogue, offering ample opportunity for performer and audience to interact.

These entertainment genres transcended not only the traditional division between audience and performer but also that between author and performer. As more and more performers created their own acts, entertainment became a function of the individual performer's courage, imagination, and training.[13] To audiences' delight, spontaneity replaced what was scripted and staid in "legitimate theater." The increasing attention paid to the performers disclosed their specific messages as well as their public personas. Because they wrote, choreographed, and often managed their own work, German-Jewish performers avoided the constraints of traditional stage roles.[14] Traditional theater worked within clearly defined scripts that could not be altered by the actors, and therefore it was much harder to determine the actors' individual motivation, personal background, or cultural baggage. Popular entertainers, by contrast, both transformed and were transformed by the act of transgressing social and cultural boundaries. Although not completely free in their choice of content, style, or costume, these entertainers actively engaged and negotiated with audiences, stage owners, municipal and national governments, and the press on an individual basis.

Popular live entertainment offered a marketplace of meaning where a fine balance between the exotic and the familiar promised both fame and revenue.

[11] For the concept of "ethnicity" and Jewish identity, see Shulamit Volkov, "Die Erfindung einer Tradition. Zur Entstehung des modernen Judentums in Deutschland," *Historische Zeitschrift* 253 (1991), 603–28; Marion Berghahn, *German-Jewish Refugees in England* (London, 1984); Till van Rahden, "Weder Milieu noch Konfession: Die situative Ethnizität der deutschen Juden im Kaiserreich in vergleichender Perspektive," in Olaf Blaschke and Frank-Michael Kuhlemann, eds., *Religion und Milieu im deutschen Kaiserreich* (Gütersloh, 1996).

[12] Homi Bhabha employs this concept in *The Location of Culture* (London, 1994). On the significance of the interactive nature of modern popular theater, see Erika Fischer-Lichte, *Die Entdeckung des Zuschauers. Paradigmenwechsel auf dem Theater des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1997); idem, *The Show and the Gaze of the Theatre: A European Perspective* (Iowa City, 1997).

[13] On the interaction between actor and audience, see Mason, *Street Theatre*, 11.

[14] This was a remarkable freedom, particularly when compared to the limited choices Jews had faced on the stage in previous centuries. For an insightful discussion of Jews in the traditional theater scene, see Hans-Joachim Neugebauer, *Judenfiguren: Drama und Theater im frühen 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1994).

This apparent commercialization, however, hindered its consideration as legitimate "high" culture. Conceiving of art "as a touchstone of the highest values of civilization," most contemporary critics denied a place in the classical cultural canon to popular entertainment because it played to the lowest common denominator.[15] For those critics, "culture" was based on distinction and was informed by specific notions of civilization and nature. This study, however, along with most scholars today in the field of cultural studies, assumes that "culture" is "ordinary" or "everyday" and that it reconstitutes itself in daily struggles and negotiations.[16] Furthermore, norms and rules applying to society at large were often suspended or inverted in the arena of popular entertainment. As will be demonstrated, the circus, *Jargon* theater, and revue theater – distinguished by their wide-ranging repertoires and socially diverse audiences – often eluded classification within either mass or elite culture. They functioned instead as experimental stages for artistic innovation, mediating between the different artistic worlds of the "popular" and the "legitimate" culture.

THE ART OF HISTORY

Most German historians, unlike their Americanist colleagues, have yet to regularly incorporate questions of ethnic identity into their research. Although there have been notable attempts to insert ethnic or minority studies, as well as issues of mass culture and mass communications, into the mainstream of German history, these efforts have remained honorable but rather isolated trials by specialists in these fields. A conceptional divide continues to separate the fields of German history and North American history, a phenomenon that Michael Geyer and Konrad Jarausch have described as the "belatedness" of German historiography.[17]

With few exceptions, neither German- nor English-speaking historians of Germany have fully appreciated the significance of performances for historical interpretation.[18] Recent revisions of such notions as "mainstream," "homogeneity," and "center and periphery" have resonated in the treatment

[15] Among many, see Ludwig Seelig, *Geschäftstheater oder Kulturtheater?* (Berlin, 1914).

[16] Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms,"in Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner, eds., *Culture/Power/History* (Princeton, NJ, 1994), 522. Hall is referring to a concept Raymond Williams puts forth in one of his earlier attempts to define culture. Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London, 1973). Among many, see the approach discussed in the informative introduction to Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson, eds., *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies* (Berkeley, CA, 1991).

[17] Michael Geyer and Konrad H. Jarausch, "Great Men and Postmodern Ruptures: Overcoming the 'Belatedness' of German Historiography," *German Studies Review* 18 (1995), 253–73.

[18] Peter Jelavich, *Berlin Cabaret* (Cambridge, MA, 1993).

of popular cinema by American historians and by film specialists, but they have failed to leave a lasting imprint on works dealing with mainstream German society. With an increasing interest in the complicated and manifold processes of identity formation, American historians have breathed new life into the study of art, by shifting the focus from styles of performance to agency, reception, and representation.[19] Fueled by an interest in multiculturalism generated by the feminist and civil rights movements in America, in the last decade the attention of scholars has been directed at issues of ethnic, racial, and sexual diversity, ambiguity, and difference. In addition, the challenges of new media technologies have led to a renewed interest in the relationship between image and information and have initiated a debate about the place of aesthetics in society.

Although questions of Jewish identity are an established topic within the study of minorities among Americanists, they have not figured prominently in cultural studies until recently. Since the mid-1980s, important though controversial studies have changed the way we understand the role of ethnic identity in mass culture. The works of Michael Rogin, Neal Gabler, and J. Hoberman have chronicled the American Jewish experience in the film industry and in society at large.[20] Central to these studies has been the question of whether it was possible for Jews in America to enter mainstream society without shedding their own ethnic or cultural specificity. Thus Gabler highlights the ways in which immigrant Jewish entrepreneurs sought to demonstrate their Americanness, yet by their actions altered the very definition of what it meant to be an American. Rogin argues that blackface minstrelsy allowed European immigrants to pass into the mainstream. Hoberman points to the function of Yiddish films in the preservation and re-creation of a distinctly Jewish culture.[21] These works direct our attention to the importance of mass media and the dynamics of cultural reaffirmation in the public sphere, a process that neither reproduces the past nor allows for cultural separatism.[22] It is clear that Jews saw the realm of entertainment as a sphere that could be especially rewarding, both in economic and in emotional terms. The new film industry was not characterized by the same prejudices against Jews that existed in

[19] See among many, Miriam Hansen, *Babel and Babylon. Spectatorship in American Silent Film* (Cambridge, MA, 1994).

[20] Michael Rogin, *Blackface, White Noise: Jewish Immigrants in the Hollywood Melting Pot* (Berkeley, CA, 1996); Neal Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood* (New York, 1988); J. Hoberman, *Bridge of Light: Yiddish Film Between Two World Wars* (Philadelphia, 1991); S. B. Cohen, ed., *From Hester Street to Hollywood: The Jewish-American Stage and Screen* (Bloomington, IN, 1983).

[21] J. Hoberman, "My Song Means as Much to My Audience as Yours to Your Congregation," *London Review of Books*, July 18, 1996, 22.

[22] Hoberman concludes that both the medium and the preservationist impulse were modern. Thus whereas the intention was oriented toward history and tradition, the product was something entirely new. Hoberman, *Bridge of Light*, 8.