



IMAGINING BLACKNESS ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CINEMATIC VISIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN LIFE

Paul R. Mullins



African American archaeology and Hollywood visions of African American experience are each rooted in a White imagination that has long contemplated itself by constructing Black identities. Cinematic Black subjectivity has offered a host of simplistic or racist misrepresentations including happy slaves in films like *Gone with the Wind*, the oversentimentalized White heroics in *Amistad*, or Jar-Jar Binks's overdone buffoonery. In 1914, African American journalist Lester Walton already saw that films were White racist imagination "representing the race at its worst," and he called for Hollywood to "emancipate the white American from his peculiar ideas" about African American life (Leab 1973:53). In 1942, Langston Hughes (2002a:219) bemoaned racist movie stereotypes, arguing that "A great many white people still accept the false grinning caricatures of the movies as being true of colored people—Negroes are happy-go-lucky, they

always smile, they always sing, they don't care what happens to them, they're not sensitive about persecution or segregation." Hughes aspired to use literature to repudiate cinematic stereotypes, and many diasporan historians have long championed a similar "vindicationist" perspective that uses rigorous scholarship to repudiate stereotypes. African American archaeologists often use archaeological data in much the same way to repudiate many of the exact same racist stereotypes (Epperson 1990; Franklin 1997; Perry and Paynter 1999; Singleton 1999; Orser and Funari 2001; Blakey 2004).

Refuting racist characterizations in archaeology and popular discourse is an essential mechanism to more reflectively interpret identity. Nevertheless, archaeology that takes racist stereotypes as its primary framework for identity risks replacing stale racial stereotypes with equally essentialist racialized identities. African American scholars have long wrestled with this challenge of how to define the African diaspora in opposition to racist representations of Blackness; simultaneously, those definitions have aspired to provide diasporic identity with some substantial cultural or experiential roots (Harris 1982; Kelley 1999:28). African American historians have long confronted the construction of Black identity in a nation that denied citizen privileges to Black subjects. This African American intellectual tradition sometimes has included essentialist appeals to African cultural heritage; however, African American historiography underscores the bankruptcy of democratic American mythologies and an easily defined Black experience (Harrison and Harrison 1999).

Richard Wright (1995:74) argued that "The Negro is America's metaphor," insisting that African American heritage and experience was American history told in its most "vivid and bloody terms." Black subjectivity from this perspective is constructed as being outside an American mainstream, while it also constitutes that same mainstream. Consequently, it is infeasible to simply reduce racial representation to either a genuine experience (and its ostensibly objective material record) or an artificial cinematic stereotype rooted in racist caricatures. Rather than think of archaeological analysis as a mechanism to refute false racist

subjectivities, archaeology should acknowledge the concrete reality of racial experience as it illuminates the social processes that construct racialized difference. An archaeology that destabilizes racial subjects should examine how and why scholars examine the African American material world, just as we critique the fascination White film audiences have with movies that examine race and African American experience.

An archaeology of life *along* the color line (as opposed to one simply *across* lines of difference) should produce a complicated picture of American experience that is not simply reduced to Black exoticism and an undefined White normality. This approach provides a complicated interpretive landscape characterized by ambiguous identities, shifting relationships between collectives, profoundly consequential politics, and unclear definitions of what even defines a collective (Meskell 2002). Embracing a radically multivalent notion of identity requires archaeologists to rethink how we define identity in material culture and how we can interpret the ways in which consumers projected distinctive contextual symbolism onto the world of things (Perry and Paynter 1999).

Untroubled by the challenge to paint a persuasive picture of social complexity across time, popular culture and films routinely distill complex experiences to essentialism that reduces African Americans to stereotypical Others. In movies, complicated differences are commonly reduced to overblown and familiar caricatures. Eric Lott (1993) argues the same case for black-face minstrelsy, indicating 19th-century White northeastern audiences came to understand and believe Black racial stereotypes based on their repetition. Yet Lott's critical insight extending vindicationist politics is that black-face belied an enduring White fascination with African America that continues to loom within mainstream cinema and a vast range of discourses including archaeology. Lott views black-face as a White effort to construct Black subjectivity in a form that simultaneously reflected an attraction to African American culture even as black-face appropriated and distorted that very culture. If archaeologists do not wrestle with how the discipline represents Black subjectivity, we risk reproducing the

poverty of mainstream Black film images: movies are filled with people of color, but they are typically stock character types that reproduce persistent racial subjectivities. Historical archaeology also risks lapsing into its own stereotypical characterizations of Blackness and thieving from diasporan culture if we do not confront the complexity of racial subjectivity.

Archaeology's "Moral Mission": Stereotype and Resistance

Archaeologists often explicitly or implicitly underscore that archaeological narratives are based in concrete material data that are substantive correctives to incomplete or biased histories. James Deetz (1993:12) voiced what may be one of the discipline's most fundamental assumptions when he noted that "historical archaeology's prime value to history lies in its promise to take into account large numbers of people who either were not included in the written record or, if they were, were included in a biased or minimal way." Theresa Singleton (1999:1) recognizes the same trend in 1960s and 1970s African American archaeologies that were part of archaeology's "moral mission: to tell the story of Americans—poor, powerless, and 'inarticulate'—who had been forgotten in the written record" (compare Armstrong 1985:262). Hollywood has embraced the comparable idea that movies can correct racist stereotypes by presenting a "truth" that was once hidden by racist ideology. In 1924, pioneer "race film" director Oscar Micheaux championed this perspective, indicating that "I have always tried to make my photoplays present the truth, to lay before the race a cross section of its own life, to view the colored heart from close range" so that film created "a racial image of which they could be proud" (Smith 2001:278–279). Micheaux was not necessarily focused on representing all African Americans, though, as much as he aimed to portray a

genteel Black model that broke from stereotypes even as it reproduced many ostensibly White American values.

Michaux's vindicationist cinema never became common in Hollywood's representations of Black identity, but many contemporary filmmakers have aspired to tell uplifting stories about African American experience that comfort White audiences even as they appear to probe the complications of Black life. Like archaeologists, moviemakers often argue that their moral tales are supported by the objectivity of historical facts, staking a claim to authenticity that shields films from a critique of how they inevitably streamline reality to provide an engaging cinematic narrative. *Amistad*, for instance, tells the story of an 1839 mutiny among enslaved Africans, wielding what co-producer Steven Spielberg celebrated as "the truth" about the mutiny. A trailer for the film boldly opens by proclaiming that the film recounts "A True Story," and when an *Amistad* novelist sued Spielberg's company, his lawyers testified that the movie "is entirely based upon history" (Jeffrey 2001:77-78). The trailer for the African American-themed Civil War film *Glory* also trumpets that it is "A True Story. They Joined for Freedom. They Fought for Honor," and the *Ghosts of Mississippi*'s trailer heralds that "This Story Is True." Much of the explicit claim to *Amistad*'s historical veracity was made on the basis of scholarly consultation (Jeffrey 2001), but the movie's sensory richness painted in speech, sets, and visual detail are perhaps the most critical building blocks for that sense of realism. For instance, the mostly African actors and actresses playing the *Amistad*'s captives spoke Mende, wore genuine metal chains, and played out the movie on lavish period sets. *Glory* likewise presents African American subjects in compelling battlefield sets with small but critical touches, such as shoes that do not come in a left and right pair and relentlessly moving music heightening battlefield combat scenes.

Amistad's visual presentation of brutality weaves a compelling story that any historical archaeologist can understand. The most powerful stories museums and archaeologists tell about enslavement often use commonplace things to underscore the

inhumanity of life in enslavement. For instance, one New Jersey home with a reputed structure for enslaved Africans bore shackles as well as caches attributed to West African spirituality, providing an interesting material contrast between domination and cultural persistence (Bankoff and Winter 2005:305). A Texas quarters contained a similar juxtaposition, including a conjurer's kit reflecting African spirituality as well as leg manacles bolted into the cabin's wall (Samford 1996:94). Patricia Samford (1996:94) details the archaeology of Chesapeake quarters architecture and paints a brutal picture with finely documented archaeological evidence, demonstrating that "keeping out cold drafts and insects was virtually impossible." Roughly eighty ankle and wrist shackles were recovered from the slave ship *Henrietta Marie*, which sank in 1700 off the Florida coast (Malcom 1998). The shackles' testimony to enslavement's brutality moved Daniel Jerome Wideman (1998) to lament that the "African leg bones formerly attached to the chains will not be found. They have long since dissolved, become fish meal, black bone and flesh passing back into the food chain, absorbed into the continuous cycle of the sea."

The bioarchaeological evidence from the African burial ground bears exceptionally powerful testimony to the lives Africans led in enslavement (Perry et al. 2006). The evidence that Africans led much shorter lives than their White neighbors and had numerous examples of traumatic or mortal injuries is a significant scholarly contribution, but the literal bodies of captive Africans may be the most critical dimension of the burial ground's unprecedented public response. Project director Michael Blakey (2001:414) recognizes that "the vivid contrasting of a human face of slavery with its dehumanizing conditions I believe accounts for much of the strong public feeling regarding this work," which has produced extensive popular press coverage. Blakey (2004:113) consciously places the burial ground's scholarship within a tradition of vindicationist African American histories. He positions the burial ground's ancestors as refutations of persistent stereotypes of "benign" northern servitude, arguing that "the most primary of evidence of northern slavery, the bones of the people

themselves, has overturned the mythology of the free north." The burial ground is indeed a rich discourse about captivity because it is told through individuals' bodily testimony contextualized within a rigorous scientific methodology. The effort to examine emotionally charged experiences with scholarly rigor—avoiding charges that scholarship is being corrupted by political positioning—is common in vindicationist scholarship.

Vindicationist cinema has often targeted the simplistic racist stereotypes dating to films' primordial moments: the brutish Black male, tragic mulatto, shiftless thief, and ever-happy slave appeared in some the earliest short silent films (Leab 1973; Berger 2005:123–134). For instance, *Amistad* co-producer Debbie Allen considered the film a racist rebuttal, declaring "that no one had dared to make a movie of the *Amistad* because the story dispelled the image of blacks as 'Sambos' who were quietly acquiescent to slavery" (Jones 1997). The dilemma with *Amistad*, in particular, and many racially themed films, in general, is that they pose transparent solutions to racist inequalities. *Amistad* ends with a compelling Supreme Court oration by John Quincy Adams that urges the justices to have "the courage to do what is right," an apparently fitting prelude to a final scene that finds the newly freed Cinque on board a ship heading back to his African home (Dalzell 1998:132). Adams's impassioned courtroom defense of freedom and the implication that his experience moved him to rethink racial boundaries intimate a rather wishful antiracist justice that is not especially well supported. The reality was that freedom came because of a legal technicality instead of the Court's recognition of servitude's injustice, and Cinque returned to a region permanently torn asunder by the slave trade.

What *Amistad* does quite well is frame the fundamental contradiction in American life, the ever-present tensions within freedom across the color line. *Amistad* screenwriter David Franzoni indicated that the film was intended to portray "timeless black American rage" (Jeffrey 2001:81), aiming to capture the resistance at the heart of diaspora culture. Yet, ultimately many Hollywood visions of racial inequality confront racism only to resolve it in

some comforting way. In *Glory*, for example, the 54th Regiment's story revolves around an African American Civil War unit under the command of White officer Robert Gould Shaw. As the African American soldiers soberly assess how their service will impact racism, the film sounds a compelling and tragic tone that is shaped by our contemporary acknowledgment that racism has never disappeared. *Glory* leans heavily on the African American soldiers' intense desire to be seen as full citizens through their military service. When the African American soldier Trip laments that the war cannot be "won," Shaw declares that there must be a victorious army. Trip, though, casts "victory" in broader terms of color line equality when he responds that "I mean, you get to go on back to Boston, big house and all that. What about us? What do we get?" Heroic wartime service has never yielded clear shifts in racism, so *Glory* uses that reality to underscore the tragic nature of these soldiers' desires. For instance, Trip questions whether any measure of service can secure citizen rights for African Americans, warning a fellow soldier that "You can march like the white man, you can talk like him. You can sing his songs, you can even wear his suits. But, you ain't never gonna be nothing more to him than an ugly ass chimp ... in a blue suit."

Glory joins *Amistad* by rather optimistically depicting the war as a cause for justice bonding people across the color line. For instance, a wise older African American soldier criticizes Trip's deep-seated contempt for Whites, concluding that "Dying's been what these white boys have been doing for going on three years now, dying by the thousands, dying for you, fool." Contemporary movie audiences' identification with the African American soldiers is heightened by the overt racism they confront within their own ranks, and the 1863 death of Shaw alongside 281 of his soldiers underscores the profoundly consequential potential of cross-racial alliances. *Glory* captures a deep-seated White desire to see the regiment's heroicism as an indication that Americans have long desired interracial cooperativeness as Shaw bonds with his Black soldiers and eventually joins them in an undifferentiated mass grave.

Joanne Sarah Barclay's (2005) analysis of civil rights movies like *Ghosts of Mississippi* and *Mississippi Burning* sounds similar suspicion of historical films that romanticize Whites' sense of racial justice. In *Mississippi Burning*, for instance, the FBI is depicted as a diligent champion for justice in the case of three murdered civil rights workers, leaving the substantial African American civil rights movement invisible. The most unsettling dimension of the film is that it portrays the 1964 civil rights movement completely through White characters, pitting the FBI against overweight drawing White southerners and reducing racism to its caricature as Klan-directed brutality limited to the nation's backwaters (Sitkoff 1989). Like *Armistead's* examination of John Quincy Adams's embrace of racial justice, *Ghosts of Mississippi* revolves around a White lawyer's growing consciousness of racist injustice and his crusade to convict the man who murdered civil rights worker Medgar Evers in 1963. These movies paint African American struggles as White fantasies of redemption, though *Ghosts of Mississippi* does at least imply that White liberals have failed to back up antiracist rhetoric with genuine structural activism (Barlowe 1998:36).

In 1961, James Baldwin delivered a scathing attack on the 1958 film *The Defiant Ones*, which painted a similarly romanticized and easy racial justice. The film told the tale of a Black and a White convict who escape a chain gang bound together, compelling them to cooperate and confront their commonalities. An exasperated Baldwin (1961:164) concluded that the idea

that Negroes and whites can learn to love each other if they are only chained together long enough runs so madly counter to the facts that it must be dismissed as one of the latest, and sickest, of the liberal fantasies. . . . These movies are designed not to trouble, but to reassure; they do not reflect reality, they merely rearrange its elements into something we can bear.

Although Baldwin considered this a bankrupt idea, the movie

was remade three times: It appeared on television in 1972 (starring women and renamed *Black Mama, White Mama*); it again was made for the small screen in 1986; and in 1996 it returned in a feature-length film called *Fled*. This ever-resurfacing plot reflects the persistent attraction of the idea that people can bridge racial difference when compelled to do so.

Precisely what constitutes cooperation and archaeological engagement across the color line is ambiguous and burdened by the same well-intended but shallow politics of movies like *Glory*. Virtually every archaeologist now considers their work “public archaeology,” but this can range across everything from speaking to visitors on an excavation site to embracing a long-term stakeholder-based project. Interchanges across the color and power lines have been featured in several films that raise familiar archaeological issues of how African American heritage is appropriated. Spike Lee's *Bamboozled* questions White expropriations of African American culture, especially the media stereotyping of African America to serve profit and reproduce Black subordination (Godfrey 2005). At the heart of *Bamboozled* is the question of precisely what defines Black identity, and Lee outlines an authentic Black identity that is being pilfered by Whites, although many African Americans have become alienated to it and broader Black social collectives (Barlowe 2003; Black 2003; Epp 2003). *Bamboozled's* premise is that African American television executive Pierre Delacroix is assailed for proposing a string of Black-themed shows that aspire to an African American middle-class identity (e.g., *The Cosby Show*). Delacroix's proposals, however, do not fit executives' sense of Black culture and are deemed “too white.” The exasperated Delacroix resolves to launch an outrageously racist show that will get him fired, hatching the idea for a minstrel show set on an Alabama plantation; the minstrel show, though, becomes a hit, confirming his boss's argument that the minstrels will “make us feel good to be Americans” and unleashing a White desire to embrace black-face stereotypes.

Lee's black-face racial masquerade is a precarious satirical venture that uses racist symbols to critique those very symbols

and the social assumptions that reproduce them along the color line. Some film critics like Roger Ebert (2000) have argued that those symbols are not viable launching pads for an antiracist critique, and many newspapers were reluctant to run advertisements for the film that featured stock Black stereotypes. *Bamboozled*, though, argues that the mechanisms of minstrelsy still structure popular cultural representations of Black subjects, and Lee responds that “I don’t think these images should be swept under a rug just because they are offensive. The *New York Times* shouldn’t not run them because they’re offensive. They’re real” (Fuchs 2002:187–188). *Bamboozled*’s closing credits likewise target concrete, if unpleasant, reflections of racism as they roll over images of Hollywood royalty in black-face (including Bing Crosby and Judy Garland) and racist Black toys, which Delacroix himself collects in the film. Lee argues that “A lot of people don’t want to deal with the images in this montage. But we’re showing them. And we’re showing that these images ... reflected accepted behavior” (Fuchs 2002:196).

There are interesting implications for African American archaeology that revolve around how race and racism should be positioned in scholarship. In 1994, for instance, Colonial Williamsburg held a slave auction reenactment, and before the reenactment had even been staged, an article in the Richmond newspaper sparked criticism throughout the region (Krutko 2003:14). Representatives from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference were among the community members who met with individuals involved with Colonial Williamsburg prior to the reenactment. The NAACP bemoaned the reenactment as a nightmarish reminder of enslavement that masqueraded as entertainment and evaded the dehumanizing effects of portraying bondage in a fifteen-minute public presentation.

Erin Krutko’s (2003:22) thesis on the auction reports that a Virginia NAACP official protesting the sale argued that “Colonial Williamsburg does not deal with real black history. ... Everything

about Colonial Williamsburg is about the oppression of my people.” When the sale reenactment began, he yelled out that “you cannot portray our history in 21-minutes ... and make it some kind of sideshow” (Krutko 2003:23). In an especially influential venue that is visited primarily by Whites, enslavement was long ignored and sanitized, so there was suspicion that Colonial Williamsburg was politically unable to paint a sufficiently dramatic picture of bondage.

In 1978, an administrator found that African American employees were “extremely skeptical that the present interpretative core could be trusted ... to develop a story of black colonial life. ... They could not really conceive that the institution they knew as Colonial Williamsburg could possibly interpret their history the way it needed to be done” (Krutko 2003:48). Such mistrust of scholars long dedicated to ignoring enslavement and African American life led an auction protestor to argue that “we are always concerned when the African holocaust is going to be portrayed ... there have been so many myths and lies and distortions in the past” (Krutko 2003:49). Nevertheless, the presentation aspired to present African American heritage as integral to the Williamsburg experience, even as it posed a jarring challenge to untroubled stereotypes of African American life. *Bamboozled* champions a similar confrontation of racism and the inequalities it has rationalized.

Colonial Williamsburg found that African American stakeholders were uneasy over the appropriation of African American heritage by White scholars, and *Bamboozled* points to similar tensions over White society’s appropriation of African American culture: Lee launches an attack on the commodified forms such as appropriation takes, ranging across Tommy Hilfinger, gangsta rap, and sitcoms. *Bamboozled* illuminates the question of how African American heritage is constructed, appropriated, employed, and even commodified, underscoring how and why White archaeologists can make a claim to being stakeholders in African American history. Many archaeologists examining African American aspire to community partnerships between White archaeologists and

Black communities, but this scholarship is compelled to explore how such authority is structured by participants' positions along the color line. Maria Franklin (1997:36) argues that "we seldom question our intentions in 'giving a voice' to people of the past. Is it simply so that people of the present can better understand and appreciate their cultural heritage and national identity?" Franklin presses African American archaeologies to clearly articulate their concrete reasons for conducting such research, or this scholarship hazards being defined as White appropriation despite "good intentions."

Historical archaeology has painted an especially sophisticated picture of the material details of enslaved plantation life, but Parker Potter (1991) argues that much of this literature fails to clearly wrestle with the structures of oppression. The dilemma is that plantation symbolism and enslavement are laden with contentious racial imagery, and enslavement's heritage remains bitterly disputed in contemporary discourse (Franklin 1997:41–42). Archaeologists are compelled to become part of this discourse, but since the 1940s the movies have overwhelmingly avoided plantation settings that were once commonplace in Hollywood films. The 1903 *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was perhaps the first of many early movies focused on antebellum plantations, and in the years leading up to World War II, African Americans on southern plantations were staples of both musicals (*Dixie* in 1929) and drama (*Gone with the Wind* in 1939). During World War II, though, the federal government pressed Hollywood to present the nation as a "melting pot" and ensure African Americans' commitment to the war (Campbell 1993:2). Disney's 1946 *Song of the South* was among the last films to romanticize an idyllic southern life, and plantations rarely appeared on film again until Blaxploitation movies in the 1970s (*Mandingo*, in which an enslaved African played by boxer Ken Norton is seduced by the plantation owner's wife, or *Quadrone*—"¼ black, ¾ white, all woman") (Guerrero 1993:31–35). Consequently, many of the contemporary popular stereotypes associated with plantation life are most clearly rooted in distant movies, rather than recent ones.

Representing Race

Langston Hughes (2002b:226) lamented in 1943 that

for a generation now, the Negro has been maligned, caricatured, and lied about on the American screen, and pictured to the whole world in theatres from Los Angeles to Bombay, Montreal to Cape Town as being nothing more than a funny-looking, dull-witted but comic servant. Even Hollywood knows that is not a true picture of American Negro life.

Confronting such stereotypes is certainly the first step toward an antiracist cinema, but a vindicationist cinema or scholarship is not inherently antiracist if they do not pose representations that can potentially step outside conventional racial subjectivity. Rather than simply conclude that movies "lie," we might instead ask how and why they represent identity and lived experience in specific ways. Movies, like all popular culture, caricature commonplace dimensions of everyday life, presenting something familiar yet portraying it in an exaggerated form: we all understand the theoretical distinction between good and bad, but it is far less clear in our everyday lives than it is on the Death Star as a horde of teddy bear Ewoks confront the coldly inhuman Darth Vader. We embrace popular culture because it provides these clearly defined experiences and resolute settlements we rarely have in our real lives.

Because race and inequality are embedded in American society, movies constantly revisit color line issues of power and racism that reflect our widespread uneasiness with these issues, but they simultaneously paint a simplistic picture. Movies capture widespread social fascination with race and Black experience, but mainstream cinema rarely frames those processes especially well or offers concrete strategies to confront and change those conditions. Historical archaeology does not necessarily move us closer

to the “truth” as much as it provides an exceptionally complicated vision of everyday life that interrogates how we define those truths and why they are socially constructed in particular forms. Whether historical archaeology can construct newly challenging subjectivities is not settled, but archaeology has produced a complex vision of African American life and the color line that has the potential to significantly destabilize simplistic archaeological representations and probe how such academic representations are rooted in broader popular culture.

References

- Armstrong, Douglas V.
 1985 An Afro-Jamaican Slave Settlement: Archaeological Investigations at Drax Hall. In *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, Theresa A. Singleton, editor, pp. 261–287. Academic Press, New York.
- Baldwin, James
 1961 *Mass Culture and the Creative Artist: Some Personal Notes, Excerpt from Mass Media in Modern Society*. Black Thought and Culture. Available online at http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/bltc/getobject_?c.3742.1./projects/artfla/databases/asp/blc/fulltext/IMAGE/5274. Accessed February 11, 2006.
- Bankoff, H. Arthur and Frederick A. Winter
 2005 The Archaeology of Slavery at the Van Cortland Plantation in the Bronx, New York. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 9(4):291–318.
- Barclay, Joanne Sarah
 2005 UnCivil War—Memory and Identity in the Reconstruction of the Civil Rights Movement. Masters of Arts thesis submitted to the Department of History, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

- Barlowe, Jamie
 1998 The “Not-Free” and “Not-Me”: Constructions of Whiteness in *Rosewood* and *Ghosts of Mississippi*. *Canadian Review of American Studies* 28(3):31–46.
- 2003 “You Must Never Be a Misrepresented People”: Spike Lee’s *Bamboozled*. *Canadian Review of American Studies* 33(1):1–15
- Berger, Martin A.
 2005 *Sight Unseen: Whiteness and American Visual Culture*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Black, Ray
 2003 Satire’s Cruellest Cut: Exorcising Blackness in Spike Lee’s *Bamboozled*. *The Black Scholar* 33(1):19–24.
- Blakey, Michael L.
 2001 Bioarchaeology of the African Diaspora in the Americas: Its Origin and Scope. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* 30:387–422.
- 2004 Theory: An Ethical Epistemology of Publicly Engaged Biocultural Research. In *The New York African Burial Ground Skeletal Biology Final Report, Vol. I*, Michael L. Blakey and Lesley M. Rankin-Hill, editors, pp. 98–115. Howard University, Washington, DC.
- Campbell, Edward D. C., Jr.
 1993 Film as Politics/Film as Business: The Blaxploitation of the Plantation. In *Hollywood as Mirror: Changing Views of “Outsiders” and “Enemies” in American Movies*, Robert Brent Toplin, editor, pp. 1–18. Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Dalzell, Frederick
 1998 Dreamworking *Amistad*: Representing Slavery, Revolt, and Freedom in America, 1839 and 1997. *The New England Quarterly* 71(1):127–133.
- Deetz, James
 1993 *Flowerdew Hundred: The Archaeology of a Virginia Plantation, 1619–1864*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.
- Ebert, Roger
 2000 Review, *Bamboozled*. [rogerebert.com](http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20001006/REVIEWS/10060301/1023). Available online at <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20001006/REVIEWS/10060301/1023>. Accessed March 12, 2006.

- Epp, Michael H.
 2003 Raising Minstrelsy: Humour, Satire and the Stereotype in *The Birth of a Nation* and *Bamboozled*. *Canadian Review of American Studies* 33(1):17-35.
- Epperson, Terrence W.
 1990 Race and the Disciplines of the Plantation. *Historical Archaeology* 24(4):29-36.
- Franklin, Maria
 1997 "Power to the People": Sociopolitics and the Archaeology of Black Americans. *Historical Archaeology* 31(3):36-50.
- Fuchs, Cynthia, editor
 2002 *Spike Lee Interviews*. University Press of Mississippi, Jackson.
- Godfrey, Esther
 2005 "To Be Real": Drag, Minstrelsy and Identity in the New Millennium. *Genders*. Available online at http://www.genders.org/g41/g41_godfrey.html. Accessed March 12, 2006.
- Guerrero, Ed
 1993 *Framing Blackness: The African American Image in Film*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Harris, Robert L.
 1982 Coming of Age: The Transformation of Afro-American Historiography. *Journal of Negro History* 67(2):107-121.
- Harrison, Ira E. and Faye V. Harrison, editors
 1999 *African American Pioneers in Anthropology*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Hughes, Langston
 2002a Negro Writers and the War. In *The Collected Works of Langston Hughes, Vol. IX: Essays on Art, Race, Politics, and World Affairs*. Christopher De Santis, editor, pp. 215-219. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.
 2002b Is Hollywood Fair to Negroes? In *The Collected Works of Langston Hughes, Vol. IX: Essays on Art, Race, Politics, and World Affairs*. Christopher De Santis, editor, pp. 226-228. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.
- Jeffrey, Julie Roy
 2001 Amistad (1997): Steven Spielberg's "True Story." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 21(1):77-96.
- Jones, Howard
 1997 A Historian Goes to Hollywood: The Spielberg Touch. *Perspectives*. Available online at <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/1997/9712/9712FILL.CFM>. Accessed January 24, 2006.
- Kelley, Robin D. G.
 1999 "But a Local Phase of a World Problem": Black History's Global Vision, 1883-1950. *Journal of American History* 86(3):1-54.
- Krutko, Erin Marie
 2003 Colonial Williamsburg's Slave Auction Re-Enactment: Controversy, African American History and Public Memory. Master of Arts thesis submitted to the Department of American Studies, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- Leab, Daniel J.
 1973 The Gamut from A to B: The Image of the Black in Pre-1915 Movies. *Political Science Quarterly* 88(1):53-70.
- Lott, Eric
 1993 *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Malcom, Corey
 1998 The Iron Bilboes of the Henrietta Marie. *The Navigator: Newsletter of the Mel Fisher Maritime Heritage Society*. Available online at <http://www.melfisher.org/research%20pdf/Iron%20Bilboes%20Article.pdf>. Accessed January 26, 2006.
- Meskill, Lynn
 2002 The Intersections of Identity and Politics in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:279-301.
- Orser, Charles E., Jr. and Pedro P. A. Funari
 2001 Archaeology and Slave Resistance and Rebellion. *World Archaeology* 33(1):61-72.
- Perry, Warren, Jean Howson, and Barbara A. Bianco, editors
 2006 *New York African Burial Ground Archaeology Final Report, Vol. I*. Report prepared by Howard University for the United States General Services Administration Northeastern and Caribbean Region, Howard University, Washington DC.

- Perry, Warren and Robert Paynter
- 1999 Artifacts, Ethnicity, and the Archaeology of African Americans. In "I, Too, Am America": *Archaeological Studies of African American Life*, Theresa A. Singleton, editor, pp. 299-310. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.
- Potter, Parker B., Jr.
- 1991 What Is the Use of Plantation Archaeology? *Historical Archaeology* 25(3):94-107.
- Samford, Patricia
- 1996 The Archaeology of African-American Slavery and Material Culture. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 53(1):87-114.
- Singleton, Theresa A.
- 1999 An Introduction to African-American Archaeology. In "I, Too, Am America": *Archaeological Studies of African-American Life*, Theresa A. Singleton, editor, pp. 1-17. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Sitkoff, Harvard
- 1989 Review, *Mississippi Burning*. *The Journal of American History* 76(3):1019-1020.
- Smith, J. Douglas
- 2001 Patrolling the Boundaries of Race: Motion Picture Censorship and Jim Crow in Virginia, 1922-1932. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 21(3):273-291.
- Wideman, Daniel Jerome
- 1998 The Door of No Return? A Journey through the Legacy of the African Slave Forts, An Excerpt. *Callaloo* 2(1)1-11.
- Wright, Richard
- 1995 *White Man, Listen! Lectures in Europe, 1950-56*. Harper Perennial, New York.